VOL 12 No 7 JULY 1982

SURVEY of Current Affairs

Government and Administration

The Royal Succession 219
Parliamentary, Ministerial and Other Salaries 219
By-election and State of the Parties 220
Northern Ireland: Review of Emergency Provisions 221

External Affairs and Defence

Defence 223
NATO Heads of Government Meeting 231
United Nations Special Session on Disarmament 233
European Community 236
The Falkland Islands 239
Gibraltar 240
Israeli Invasion of Lebanon 241
Shorter Notes
First Commonwealth Employment and Labour Ministers' Meeting 245; African Development Fund 245; Mauritius: Ilois Agreement 246

Economic and Scientific Affairs

Nationalised Industries and Export Achievement 247
Youth Training Scheme 248
Aid for the Regions and Tourism 251
Shorter Notes
National Enterprise Board 252; Channel Tunnel 252; Radio-telephone Services 253

Social and Cultural Affairs

1981 Census: National and Regional Summary 254
The Police and the Community 256
Ancient Monuments and Historic Buildings 257
The Arts in Britain 257
Shorter Note
Sports Sponsorship by the Tobacco Industry 258

Documentation 259

Published for British Information Services by
Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London

Annual subscription including postage and index £20.42

The *Survey of Current Affairs* is produced for British Information Services overseas, but in response to requests has also been made available in Britain. Subscription and distribution inquiries should be addressed to Her Majesty's Stationery Office, P.O. Box 569, London SE1 9NH, and editorial inquiries to Reference Division, Central Office of Information, Hercules Road, Westminster Bridge Road, London SE1 7DU. Although the material is Crown Copyright, it may be reproduced without special permission.
Other documents produced by Reference Division if not on sale through Her Majesty's Stationery Office, may be obtained direct from Reference Division on payment of a small charge.

GOVERNMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

The Royal Succession

The order of succession to the throne has been altered by the birth of the Queen's third grandchild.

The first child of the Prince and Princess of Wales, a son born on 21 June, becomes second in line of succession to the throne. He is preceded only by his father and immediately precedes his uncles, Prince Andrew and Prince Edward. The child is to be named William Arthur Philip Louis and will be known as Prince William of Wales.

Moving an humble Address in the House of Commons on 24 June (*Hansard*, Vol 26, No 139, cols 447–50) the Prime Minister, Mrs Thatcher, said that every new young Prince or Princess represents the continuity of the royal family, and reminds the House of the unique service which the monarchy renders to the British people at home or abroad. She added that though the world has changed dramatically since the Prince of Wales was born, the traditions of the monarchy are cherished by the British people as deeply as ever.

Parliamentary, Ministerial and Other Salaries

Ministers and other Members of Parliament have received salary increases of 4 per cent; similar increases in parliamentary allowances and peers' expenses allowances have also been made. The increases were approved in the House of Commons on 10 June and in the House of Lords on 14 June.

In a statement on 10 June (*Hansard*, Vol 25, Nos 129-30, cols 462-521), the Lord President of the Council and Leader of the House of Commons, Mr John Biffen, said that the Government considered it reasonable to increase ministers' and MPs' pay by 4 per cent, in line with the pay factor included in the Estimates. This decision had been made in the absence of recommendations by the Review Body on Top Salaries, which had not been asked to review MPs' pay and allowances for 1982 because, at the time the Government would have had to make the request, the Select Committee on Members' Salaries was still deliberating, and the Government did not wish to prejudge its conclusions.[1]

Referring to the future method of determining MPs' pay and commenting on the great value in having a completely independent review, Mr Biffen said that the Government accepted the recommendation in the Select Committee's Report that the Review Body should review MPs' salaries once during the fourth year of each Parliament. The coming year would be the fourth one of the present Parliament and the Government therefore proposed to ask the Review Body to conduct a review in time for next year's debate on MPs' pay.

The Government, however, could not accept the Select Committee's second recommendation: that, in the four years between the review, MPs' salaries should be adjusted annually by reference to increases in outside salaries, with figures taken from the *New Earnings Survey*.[2] The Government accepted with reluctance the need for some form of salary linkage, but not that the link should be automatic nor that it should be with the *New Earnings Survey*. If the House were not prepared to accept the responsibility of discussing pay increases once a year, a great deal of well-justified anxiety and suspicion would ensue. Mr Biffen said: 'As for the form of the link, whatever may be the relationship in the long run between average earnings and those in the public service, it is right in principle that MPs' pay should keep in step with that of public servants. Any other system would be certain to give rise to bad feeling.' The Government, therefore, proposed that 'between reviews [it] should move annual motions to effect changes in Members' salaries and in so doing should be guided by the average change in the rates of pay of appropriate groups in the public service for the period concerned'. At the same time the Government reserved 'the right to respond flexibly to exceptional circumstances'. Mr Biffen concluded that if the House supported the proposals, it would have taken 'a modest step in the direction of freeing Members' pay from the capricious circumstances that have attended it in recent years'.

[1]The Select Committee reported in February; see *Report No 1 from the Select Committee on Members' Salaries: Session 1981–82*, HC 208. HMSO, £4·75. ISBN 0 10 220882 4.

[2]The *New Earnings Survey*, issued annually by the Department of Employment, is an analysis of earnings and hours worked based on a sample survey of employees in England, Wales and Scotland.

Members of Parliament

The basic annual salary of MPs has been increased from £13,950 to £14,510, effective from 13 June 1982. Increases in parliamentary allowances have also been kept within the 4 per cent limit. Secretarial and research assistance allowances payable to MPs have been increased from £8,480 to £8,752 for the year ending 31 March 1983 and to £8,820 for any subsequent year. In addition, the free travel warrant system for the wives and husbands of MPs, entitling them to up to 15 free return journeys to Westminster on parliamentary business, has been extended to MPs' children under 18 years of age.

Ministers and Other Office Holders

The new salaries of ministers and certain other office holders are as follows:

	Previous salary £	*New salary* £
Prime Minister[1]		
Lord Chancellor[1]	27,825	28,950
Cabinet Ministers		
Minister of State (Commons)	19,775	20,575
Minister of State (Lords)	23,275	24,200
Parliamentary Secretaries (Commons)	15,100	15,700
Parliamentary Secretaries (Lords)	18,600	19,350
Attorney-General	29,525	30,700
Solicitor-General	24,375	25,350
Lord Advocate	27,875	29,000
Solicitor-General for Scotland	20,925	21,750
House of Commons		
Leader of the Opposition	25,550	26,575
Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury (Chief Whip)	23,225	24,150
Deputy Chief Whip	19,775	20,575
Opposition Chief Whip	19,775	20,575
Government Whips	12,775	13,275
Opposition Deputy Chief Whip	12,775	13,275
Speaker of the House of Commons	29,150	30,325
House of Lords		
Chief Whip	23,275	24,200
Deputy Chief Whip	18,600	19,350
Government Whip	16,275	16,925
Chief Opposition Whip	16,275	16,925
Leader of the Opposition in the House of Lords	18,600	19,925

Parliamentary Salary

In addition, ministers and office holders in the House of Commons receive a parliamentary salary in recognition of their constituency responsibilities as distinct from their ministerial or other responsibilities. This has risen from £8,130 to £8,460.

Peers' Expenses

From 1 July 1982 the following maximum daily rates may be claimed by peers for expenses incurred in attending the House of Lords:

	£
Overnight subsistence	25·40
Day subsistence and incidental travel	12·10
Secretarial costs, postage and certain other additional expenses	11·00

Members of the House of Lords receiving a ministerial salary and the Chairman and Principal Deputy Chairman of Committees may claim an allowance for secretarial assistance up to an annual maximum of £1,300. In addition, peers receive reimbursement for travelling expenses. The increases were agreed in the House of Lords on 14 June (*Hansard* (*HL*), Vol 431, No 103, cols 453-6).

[1]As in previous years, the Prime Minister and the Lord Chancellor have decided to draw no more than the salary payable to other Cabinet Ministers.

By-election and State of the Parties

Details of the result of a recent by-election and the present state of the parties in the House of Commons are given below.

The Labour Party retained the seat at Coatbridge and Airdrie in a parliamentary by-election on 24 June. The seat became vacant when its holder, Mr James Dempsey, died in May. The Labour candidate, Mr Thomas Clarke, won by a majority of 10,090 votes.

The results were as follows:

T. Clarke (Labour)	19,208
H. de Burgh (Conservative)	9,118
R. Wyllie (Scottish National Party)	3,652
A. Henderson (Liberal-Social Democratic Alliance)	2,873

Both the Liberal-Social Democratic Alliance and Scottish National Party candidates lost their deposits; 56·3 per cent of the electorate voted.

State of the Parties

The state of the parties in the House of Commons is now as follows:

Conservative	334
Labour	238
Social Democratic	30
Liberal	12
Scottish National	2
Plaid Cymru (Welsh Nationalist)	2
Official Unionist (Northern Ireland)	5
Democratic Unionist (Northern Ireland)	3
United Ulster (Northern Ireland)	1
Ulster Progressive Unionist (Northern Ireland)	1
Independent Socialist (Northern Ireland)	1
Anti-H-Block Proxy Prisoner (Northern Ireland)	1
Vacant	1
TOTAL	631

The four remaining seats are held by the Speaker of the House of Commons and his three deputies (the Chairman of Ways and Means and the first and second Deputy Chairmen of Ways and Means) who do not vote except in their official capacity in the event of a tie. The overall Government majority in the House of Commons is 38.

Northern Ireland: Review of Emergency Provisions

A review of the Northern Ireland (Emergency Provisions) Act 1978 has been announced by the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland in a debate on an Order renewing the legislation for a further six months. While acknowledging a 'slight abatement' in the level of violence in Northern Ireland the Government considers that the Act should remain in force but believes that an inquiry should be undertaken to determine whether all its provisions are still strictly necessary. An Order extending direct rule for another year was also approved.

The Northern Ireland (Emergency Provisions) Act 1978 provides the security forces with special powers to arrest and search persons suspected of being involved in terrorism and enables the Secretary of State to proscribe organisations engaging in terrorist activities. It also provides for terrorist-type – 'scheduled' – offences to be tried by a High Court judge sitting without a jury. Because of the wide powers conferred by the Act its provisions are temporary and would lapse unless renewed every six months by Parliament. In addition, like the Prevention of Terrorism (Temporary Provisions) Act 1976, the legislation has been subject to independent review and in 1975 the Northern Ireland (Emergency Provisions) Act 1973, which preceded the 1978 Act, was reviewed by a committee under the chairmanship of Lord Gardiner.

Review of Legislation

During a debate in the House of Commons on 30 June on the renewal of the Northern Ireland (Emergency Provisions) Act 1978 (*Hansard*, Vol 26, No 143, cols 941-98), the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland, Mr James Prior, announced his intention to conduct a review of the legislation. He said that in the present circumstances there was no question of doing away with essential emergency provisions but these exceptional powers should be looked at with the greatest care. The success of the Government's security policy depended upon commanding the support of the community. The present provisions had been in force for many years – although it had been possible to drop the provision for detention. Lord Gardiner had reviewed the previous legislation in 1975 and the resulting arrangements were incorporated in the present Act. Mr Prior believed, however, that debates on the renewal of the Act should be informed by a further independent review.

Such a review would enable the House to take a balanced judgment on whether each provision of the Act was still strictly necessary and whether specific amendments were needed. Those who believed that the Act was essential should still carry the conviction of the House and public opinion by being prepared to submit the legislation to periodic review. The review should take into account the conclusions of the review of the Prevention of Terrorism (Temporary Provisions) Act 1976 already being undertaken by Lord Jellicoe (see p 102). The purpose of the new review would be to check that the additional powers given to the security forces in Northern Ireland to protect persons and property against terrorists were still serving their purpose effectively but with the minimum impact on the ordinary civil liberties of the subject. He expected to set up the review in September or October.

Security Situation

Earlier in his speech Mr Prior said that progress on the political front had an important contribution to make to diminishing the tensions in Northern Ireland on which terrorists fed. They did not want stability and would try to obstruct progress towards it. The relentless pressure on their criminal activities had to be maintained. Mr Prior praised the men and women of the security forces who faced exceptional hazards in the course of their duties and also while off duty. The task of the armed forces, in support of the civil power, was to defend people against terrorist attack, and the aim of the Government's security policy was to eliminate terrorism and extend normal policing throughout Northern Ireland. This meant arresting offenders, bringing cogent evidence to the courts and winning convictions in open court. The primary role was played by the Royal Ulster Constabulary which was well-manned and equipped. The past ten years had seen a steady development in its professionalism and expertise. Its strength had increased from 4,115 in 1972 to 7,511 at present; its quality was as high as that of any police force in the British Isles and some of the young men entering it were of exceptional ability. The security being sought in Northern Ireland was the freedom for people to go about their daily lives in peace, free from the threat of violent attack. This required the confidence of the whole community in the ability of the police and the courts to act impartially and fairly to enforce the law and administer justice.

During 1981, 557 people were convicted of scheduled offences on indictment and 90 of them received sentences of 10 years' imprisonment or more. Up to 14 June this year charges had been laid in respect of 384 serious terrorist offences, 31 of which were for murder and 54 for attempted murder. That record had been matched by a slight abatement in the level of violence and fitted a long-term trend that was broadly positive. Despite all the provocations and anguish of 1981 the vast majority of people on both sides of the community had demonstrated once again their rejection of violence.

In the first five months of 1982 there were 168 shooting incidents in the Province and 106 bomb explosions, involving 5,834 lb of explosives. Fourteen members of the security forces and 22 civilians had been killed this year compared with 17 members of the security forces and 32 civilians in the last six months of 1981. Physical injuries during the first five months of this year numbered 246 compared with 624 in the last six months of last. Large quantities of ammunition and detonators had again been found and 176 firearms

recovered. All this served as a reminder that the Government should not relax its vigilance nor become complacent about the security situation.

Opposition View

The Opposition spokesman on Northern Ireland, Mr Don Concannon, welcomed the Government's decision to undertake a review of the emergency provisions and said that the Opposition had asked for such a review on previous occasions over the past two years. His party had long believed that the emergency powers of arrest, interrogation and trials without jury were a continuing source of grievance and friction. If a certain power was no longer necessary it should be discontinued and the normal processes of law resumed. There were areas of concern that he believed the inquiry should examine. These included the power of the police to arrest anyone suspected of being a terrorist and the powers of interrogation accorded to them. The rule on admissibility of confessions was also a matter of controversy. Lord Gardiner had concluded that trials without jury were necessary because of the intimidation of witnesses and juries. The inquiry should determine whether intimidation was still rife. It might be possible to 'deschedule' some of the offences now referred to these courts. It was difficult to imagine that all the present scheduled offences were committed with aims of terrorism in mind.

Extension of Direct Rule

Introducing an Order on 30 June to extend the provisions of the Northern Ireland Act 1974 for a further 12 months (*Hansard*, Vol 26, No 144, cols 999-1016), Mr Prior said that the Government recognised both the strengths and weaknesses of direct rule. Over the years it had secured a measure of acceptance in both parts of the community, its impartiality was generally recognised and it enabled the Northern Ireland departments to discharge their duties efficiently. Its main weakness was political – it did not meet the exceptional political needs of Northern Ireland. The Northern Ireland Bill (see pp 176-8) represented a positive and constructive attempt to respond to those needs. If elected representatives in Northern Ireland could reach agreement on arrangements either for partial or full devolution acceptable to both sides of the community the machinery of direct rule could be brought to an end in respect of some or all of the Northern Ireland departments.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND DEFENCE

Defence

The British Government's commitment to a defence policy designed to meet both the threat posed by the nuclear and conventional forces of the Warsaw Pact and challenges to British interests at home and abroad was reaffirmed by the Secretary of State for Defence in a parliamentary debate on the annual defence White Paper in July. The White Paper, *Statement on the Defence Estimates 1982*, was published in June.[1]

The White Paper was prepared before the Argentine invasion of the Falkland Islands in April (see pp 105-12). Referring to this in a foreword to the White Paper, the Secretary of State for Defence, Mr John Nott, said that Britain's response to the invasion was 'visible evidence that our force structure is adaptable enough to permit an effective and timely response to developments both within and outside the NATO [North Atlantic Treaty Organisation] area'. The main threat to Britain's security, however, remained the nuclear and conventional forces of the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact allies, and the defence programme outlined in the 1981 defence review (see pp 195-7, 1981) was designed to meet this threat. The framework of this programme remained appropriate, Mr Nott added, but in the coming months the experience of the Falkland Islands operation would be examined to see what adjustments needed to be made.

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE

Secretary of State's Speech

Opening the debate on 1 July (*Hansard*, Vol 26, No 144, cols 1056-129, and Vol 27, No 147, cols 153-238), the Secretary of State for Defence, Mr John Nott, told the House that the first duty of any British Government was to safeguard the British people in peace and freedom. This duty rested on three defence commitments: the maintenance of a credible strategic nuclear capability to deter nuclear blackmail; the collective security provided through Britain's contribution to NATO of strong naval, army and air forces for the defence of the West; and a force structure, within the NATO framework, which had the balance and flexibility to enable Britain to respond to a challenge to its interests at home or abroad. Recent events in the South Atlantic (see p 239) had concentrated attention on the last commitment – the ability to respond in defence of uniquely British interests – although Britain's determination to resist aggression had strengthened the whole deterrence strategy of the West.

South Atlantic Operations

In reviewing the achievements of Britain's forces in the South Atlantic, Mr Nott pointed to some operational successes of relevance for future defence planning. These included the performance of the Sea Harriers, which had achieved at least 28 kills without a single loss in air-to-air combat and an operational availability of 90 per cent for all aircraft throughout the campaign; the extensive use made of air-to-air refuelling by Hercules supply and Nimrod maritime reconnaissance aircraft (7 and 13 of these respectively were now adapted for this); the involvement of the merchant marine (more than 50 vessels at the height of the campaign), which had shown, among other things, that modifications like fitting helicopter platforms and at-sea refuelling facilities could be made quickly and efficiently; and the performance of helicopters in the anti-submarine warfare, troop carrying, supply and ground attack roles. In particular, it had been demonstrated that helicopter support was vital in land operations.

New Orders

In the light of these developments, the Secretary of State announced that orders would be placed for 14 Sea Harriers, 7 being financed out of replacement funds and 7 out of the existing programme; that the existing order for Sea King helicopters would be raised from 5 to 16, of which 8 would be equipped for anti-submarine warfare and 8 for commando operations; and that 3 Lynx and up to 5 Gazelle helicopters would be purchased along with 3 Chinooks to replace those lost in the Falklands operation. Increased resources would also be devoted to in-flight refuelling, Mr Nott stated, adding that 6 Vulcans and 4 Hercules aircraft were being converted to the tanker role to supplement the Victor tankers already in service and the VC10s already planned for. This capability would be particularly valuable in the United Kingdom air defence region, extending Britain's ability to maintain combat air patrols over the North Sea, and in enabling it to project

[1]Vol I, Cmnd 8529-I, HMSO, £4. ISBN 0 10 185290 8. Vol II (Defence Statistics), Cmnd 8529-II, HMSO, £4·50. ISBN 0 10 185291 6.

its power further afield when necessary. Finally, Mr Nott told the House that HMS *Endurance*, the ice-patrol vessel, would remain in service and would return to the South Atlantic after a refit.

The Army

Turning to Britain's role in NATO, the Secretary of State reaffirmed Britain's existing commitments to forward defence in Central Europe. Those who argued for a reduction of these ignored the fact that such action would weaken not strengthen Britain's security, since none of Britain's allies were in a position to fill the gap left by a British withdrawal. They also ignored the political significance of such action, both with respect to the conclusions the Soviet Union would draw from any reduction in Britain's commitment at present despite events in Poland and Afghanistan, and the effect it would have on Britain's allies, particularly the United States, which maintained 200,000 army personnel in the Federal Republic of Germany. In addition, Mr Nott said, it would cost more in the short- and medium-term to resettle the forces in Britain than to leave them in Europe.

Britain's forces in Europe, Mr Nott continued, were being reorganised to produce the most balanced, effective and powerful deterrent to a potential aggressor (see p 196, 1981). As a result, the British Army of the Rhine (BAOR) would have three larger and more powerful divisions stationed in Europe, together with a credible reserve [a division] stationed in Britain. A non-mechanised infantry battalion and an artillery regiment would also be stationed in Britain. In addition, the number of BAOR's manned tanks had increased by 25 per cent over the last three years, a ninth armoured regiment had been formed, and the introduction of the Challenger main battle tank in the mid-1980s (see pp 233-4, 1980), would permit the formation of two more armoured regiments and the provision of a full complement of Chieftain tanks as a war maintenance reserve. The future needs of the infantry were also being studied with a view to equipping them with a range of vehicles capable of providing both the latest armour protection and the mobility to fight in depth against greater numbers; while ground air defences would be improved with the entry into service in the next couple of years of self-propelled Rapier batteries. The delivery to BAOR of the towed version of the Blindfire Rapier system had been completed.

At the same time, improvements to forces stationed in Britain included an increase in the size of the Territorial Army, the establishment of a new Home Service Force, the formation of three additional Royal Auxiliary Air Force Regiment squadrons for airfield ground defence, and the formation of a new, predominantly Territorial Army, reinforcing division for BAOR. Consideration was also being given to providing the last with a support squadron of Wessex helicopters over the next few years.

The Royal Air Force

Turning to the Royal Air Force, Mr Nott pointed out that its air defence capability would be significantly strengthened with the introduction of the air defence variant of the Tornado aircraft, greatly enhanced by air-to-air refuelling, the entry into service of the Nimrod airborne early warning aircraft, and the modernisation of the United Kingdom Air Defence Ground Environment radar system. Similarly, to improve the Royal Air Force's ground attack forces, the Government intended to acquire 60 advanced Harrier GR5s (the AV8B) as well as to replace the Harrier GR3s lost in the Falkland Islands. The GR3, having been equipped with the Sidewinder air-to-air missile for service in the South Atlantic, now had an air combat capability to add to its principal ground attack weapons. In the meantime, the programme to equip about half of the Royal Air Force's front line squadrons with the Tornado GR1 was continuing, all 220 having now been ordered (along with 70 of the air defence variant). Improvements to maritime air forces included equipping Nimrod maritime reconnaissance aircraft with Harpoon, enabling it to attack as well as identify surface ships at a distance of some 70 miles (double the range of the Exocet missile) and the planned introduction of the Sea-Eagle anti-ship missile for service with Buccaneer, Sea Harrier and possibly Tornado aircraft.

Naval Forces

The replacement of ships lost in the South Atlantic would be considered over the next few months, the Secretary of State explained, but in the meantime the Government had decided to order, within the existing programme, another Type 22 anti-submarine warfare frigate (the ninth) and to retain two County class destroyers and the Type 82 destroyer *Bristol* which had been planned for early disposal by the mid-1980s. Detailed development work on the Type 23 frigate, which was planned to enter service in the late 1980s, was about to begin, Mr Nott continued. This would be a general purpose frigate, suited to operations outside the NATO area, and fully able to conduct anti-submarine warfare operations in the operationally difficult environment of the North Atlantic. It would be equipped with the latest sonar, both hull mounted and towed, and its armament would include the Sea Wolf point defence system (incorporating the latest improvements now under development), an anti-ship missile capability, self-defence capability against submarine attack and a light gun. The most important feature, however, would be the facility to take the planned replacement for the Sea King helicopter, which will be heavier and more agile than the Sea King, enabling it to operate safely from small ships in bad weather. Armed with Sting Ray torpedoes, it will have a full anti-submarine warfare capability.

The Government attached particular importance to increasing the submarine flotilla, Mr Nott explained. To achieve a hunter-killer submarine force of 17 later in the 1980s, one new vessel will be ordered in each of the next two years and, if resources permit, a third before work begins on the Trident programme. Work was also well advanced on a new class of conventionally powered submarines, which were difficult to

detect and in many ways superior to hunter-killer submarines in shallow waters, the first orders expecting to be placed in 1983-84. Some submarines were being equipped with the Sub-Harpoon anti-ship missile and the new heavyweight torpedo.

Expenditure

In conclusion, Mr Nott said that the cost of the programme which he had outlined, including Trident (see pp 63-4), would be contained within the planned expenditure announced by the Government, that is, within the 3 per cent annual increase in defence expenditure in line with the target set by NATO. Additional funds, however, would be available for the replacement of warships and equipment lost in the South Atlantic.

Opposition Views

The Opposition spokesman on defence, Mr John Silkin, thought that the defence White Paper should not have been published until after the lessons of the Falkland Islands operation had been examined. He believed that, had the Argentine invasion occurred after the force structure and defence programme outlined in the 1981 defence review had been fully implemented, then the recent operations in the South Atlantic would have been impossible. Criticising the Government for reducing the size of the fleet, Mr Silkin said that Britain needed a surface fleet if it were to fulfil its obligations to keep peace outside NATO, and suggested that in future years it would be required to support a United Nations police force. With regard to Britain's NATO commitments, he thought there should be a more equitable sharing of the burden within the Alliance. He did not support the purchase of Trident which, he estimated, would cost some £10,000 million.

Speaking for the Social Democratic Party, Dr David Owen supported the Government in its commitment to the NATO target of a real annual increase in defence expenditure of 3 per cent. He opposed the purchase of Trident, however, which he thought too costly for Britain, and suggested that a decision on the replacement of Polaris, which should continue in service, need not be taken for another eight years or so. This proposal would leave additional resources available for conventional forces. Dr Owen also considered that, as long as it had the capacity to do so, Britain should maintain the capability to reinforce its foreign policy world-wide.

Speaking for the Liberal Party, Mr Stephen Ross said that the party had long opposed the concept of an independant deterrent and believed that the purchase of Trident would have a seriously constricting effect on the provision of adequate conventional equipment. He wanted more money spent on the development and purchase of the best conventional weapons for Britain's NATO forces, and thought that this would help raise the nuclear threshold and therefore positively reduce the threat of nuclear war. The Liberal Party supported the establishment of a battlefield nuclear-weapon-free zone in Europe.

DEFENCE WHITE PAPER

The White Paper, drawn up prior to the Falkland Islands crisis, does not take account of the losses incurred during the operations in the South Atlantic. It describes developments over the last year and the programmes and activities in progress in the period leading up to March 1982.

The last year has brought no easing of tensions between East and West, the White Paper states, the Soviet Union having again displayed its readiness to make use of military power both directly and indirectly in pursuit of political objectives. Soviet forces in Afghanistan are brutally suppressing popular resistance with complete disregard for international opinion and law. In Eastern Europe, they were deployed on several occasions in 1981 to increase pressure on the Polish people to halt the reform process; and Soviet leaders were closely involved in planning the imposition of martial law in Poland (see pp 7-12). Above all, the rapid build-up of Soviet nuclear and conventional forces has continued unabated.

In the face of all this, Western Governments have had no choice but to take further steps to strengthen their collective defence. For its part, Britain has taken fundamental decisions to modernise its strategic nuclear deterrent and to restructure its conventional forces.

NUCLEAR FORCES

Britain's nuclear forces, the White Paper comments, make a unique contribution to NATO's collective defences, and are the ultimate guarantee of Britain's security.

Strategic Deterrent

Britain's decision to modernise its strategic nuclear deterrent with the Trident missile system has been criticised on moral grounds by some people, and by others arguing for an alternative use of resources. The Government acknowledges the sincerity of those holding these views, the White Paper states, but believes them to be wrong. As long as Britain's potential enemies possess nuclear weapons, the Government believes it would be folly for Britain to surrender its strategic nuclear deterrent. At the same time, however, like sensible people everywhere, it abhors the fearsome potential of nuclear weapons and will pursue the cause of multilateral arms reductions with vigour and determination.

The possession of an independent and invulnerable strategic deterrent, the White Paper continues, makes a conventional or nuclear attack by the Soviet Union on Britain and its NATO Allies less likely. Deterrence is a matter of showing to a potential aggressor that the risks involved in starting a war far outweigh any possible gains. The striking power of Britain's nuclear forces ensures the risk of appalling damage to an aggressor – more damage than any rational being could regard as acceptable for a military adventure in Europe. This is not to say that Britain's deterrent is a substitute for the United States nuclear guarantee; the United States has consistently shown by its maintenance of strong conventional

and nuclear forces in Europe that it sees its own security as indissolubly linked to that of Western Europe. Those who argue that expenditure on Trident would be better devoted to strengthening Britain's conventional forces, however, must consider whether the Soviet Union is more likely to be deterred by an invulnerable second strike submarine-launched ballistic missile force or, for example, two additional armoured divisions with 300 extra tanks (even if this were a sensible alternative), given that the Warsaw Pact already outnumbers NATO in tanks by some 30,000.

The suggestion to deploy cruise missiles on submarines would be far more costly than a Trident force. Since Trident carries multiple warheads, many more cruise missiles would be needed to achieve the same striking power, along with many more submarines, the costliest element of the strategic force, to deploy them continuously. As for the alternative of installing very small numbers of cruise missiles on existing hunter-killer submarines, the White Paper notes that, apart from the doubtful deterrent value of such a small force, the role of hunter-killer submarines is incompatible with that of a strategic force, both in deployment area and nature of operations. In addition, because of the comparatively short range of cruise missiles, the submarines, of whatever type, would have less sea-room in which to hide and thus would be more vulnerable.

Turning to other aspects of the modernisation decision, the White Paper points out that the submarines will be equipped with improved sonars which will significantly improve their defensive capability and have the potential for further development to counter increased Soviet capabilities during the lifetime of the force, and will be powered by a new reactor and propulsion system with a longer core life and reduced operating noise, these being particularly important factors for the maintenance of a continuous and invulnerable deterrent. Since this will increase the operational availability of each submarine, it has been decided to have a four-boat force rather than the five boats that had once been considered. To have abided by the original decision to buy Trident I, would have meant it entering service with the Royal Navy in the mid-1990s, a few years before it is likely to be withdrawn by the United States Navy. Britain's Trident II force, however, will retain 'commonality' with the United States system throughout its projected life, thus enabling Britain to have continued assurance of reliability without the large investment programme which would otherwise be needed. Britain would also benefit from significantly reduced operating costs. Trident II will have the ability to carry more warheads than Trident I, and therefore fewer missile tubes will be required on each submarine in order to maintain the same deterrent capability as was originally planned with Trident I. The Government has decided, however, to continue to equip the submarines with 16 tubes, since a larger number of tubes provides more flexibility to cope with possible improvements in Soviet anti-ballistic missile defences. This does not mean, the White Paper emphasises, that Britain intends to deploy the maximum number of missiles and warheads that is theoretically possible. The Government does not normally comment on such matters, but the move to Trident II will not involve any significant change in the planned total number of warheads as compared with the original intention for a Trident I force.

At September 1980 prices the additional cost arising from the adoption of Trident II is £390 million, bringing the total cost to £5,990 million as compared to the original maximum estimate for a Trident I force of £5,125 million. Allowing for inflation and using September 1981 prices, the total cost is £7,500 million. This is not excessive in relation to expenditure on other capabilities: costed on the same basis, the Tornado aircraft cost £11,300 million. Over the period during which it will be introduced into service, it is estimated that Trident will account for some 3 per cent of the defence budget.

Strategic Nuclear Arms Control

Noting Britain's support for the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks between the United States and the Soviet Union (see p 190), the White Paper explains that Britain's strategic deterrent force cannot feature in these 'bilateral' negotiations. In any event, it represents only a very small proportion of the strategic forces of these two states, and is of the minimum size compatible with ensuring a cost-effective deterrent at all times. This will remain the case with Trident as it is with Polaris, but should these circumstances change significantly the Government will review the position.

Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces

The Geneva talks on intermediate-range nuclear forces offer the earliest prospect of reducing the level of nuclear forces held by both East and West (see p 190). If the Soviet Union responds constructively to the United States' 'zero option' proposal (this calls for the dismantling of all Soviet SS4, SS5 and SS20 missiles in exchange for the cancellation of NATO's intermediate nuclear forces modernisation programme) then real progress in reducing nuclear arsenals can be made. The United States proposal concentrates on land-based missiles as the most threatening systems on both sides, so as to keep the negotiations manageable and improve the prospect of an early agreement. NATO is prepared to examine other systems in subsequent phases of the negotiations.

NATO has also made it clear that it is ready to modify or cancel its modernisation programme if the Geneva talks produce concrete results. To do so in the absence of agreement, however, would give the Soviet Union no incentive to negotiate seriously; conversely a determination by NATO to continue with its plans will increase the prospects for success. The first deployments under the programme, including those at Greenham Common in Britain, will become operational towards the end of 1983.

Future Developments

Like other weapon systems, nuclear weapons have to be regularly modernised to maintain their

effectiveness. NATO is therefore introducing nuclear-capable aircraft like the F16 and Tornado to replace the older F104s and Vulcans. The Soviet Union's forces have been modernised more rapidly, with the introduction since 1975 of three new types of intercontinental ballistic missile, three new submarine-launched ballistic missiles and four new types of theatre missile. While there is no need to match the Soviet Union weapon for weapon, the White Paper comments, NATO must maintain a sufficient range and balance of nuclear forces for deterrence to work. Following the reduction of 1,000 warheads in the United States' stockpile in Europe, NATO has embarked on a review of its stockpile of theatre nuclear armoury.

CONVENTIONAL FORCES

Reaffirming the Government's commitment to maintain Britain's vital contribution to the Central Front in Europe, in the Eastern Atlantic and Channel, and in defence of the United Kingdom base, the White Paper describes a number of steps the Government has taken to improve the quality of Britain's conventional forces.

Personnel

The armed forces totalled some 331,600 personnel at the beginning of 1982, of whom 74,000 were in the Royal Navy and Royal Marines, 165,700 in the Army and 91,900 in the Royal Air Force. A functional analysis of personnel in 1982-83, including civilians employed by the Ministry of Defence, is given in the table. Reserve forces totalled 272,900, of whom 195,800 were regular reserves and 77,100 were volunteer reserves and auxiliary forces. Cadet forces numbered 141,200.

Compared with three years ago when the forces were experiencing serious manning problems, with low recruiting and high voluntary wastage levels resulting in under-strength front line units, the situation has been transformed. With a few minor exceptions in specialist categories, none of the Services are experiencing recruiting difficulties. In the Royal Navy recruiting targets are being reached despite a significant raising of entry standards, while the Army is fully manned with fewer trained personnel leaving than at any time since the ending of conscription. The number of manned tanks has increased from 469 to 590 in the Federal Republic of Germany, and a ninth armoured regiment had been formed. The strength of the Territorial Army has risen by 10,000. Voluntary wastage in the Royal Air Force has fallen to around 1 per cent. As a consequence the Services can now be more selective in accepting entrants, and this, together with the retention of trained and experienced personnel, has significantly improved the general quality of all three. In line with the revised force structure set out in the 1981 defence review, the overall strength of the forces is planned to be reduced by between 18,000 and 20,000 by 1986.

The regular reserve forces play an essential part in Britain's defence plans, none more than the Territorial Army which provides almost 30 per cent of the Army's mobilised strength and has a vital reinforcing role for the BAOR. It is planned to expand this force from about 70,000 in April 1981 to some 86,000 by the early 1990s and to improve its operational efficiency through increased training, structural reorganisation and providing it as far as possible with the same equipment as the regular Army. The air defence regiments now have the Blowpipe missile and the field regiments the 105-mm light gun, while the infantry battalions with BAOR roles are about to begin re-equipping with the Milan anti-tank guided weapon. BAOR's reserve infantry division stationed in Britain consists predominantly of Territorial Army units.

A new Home Service Force, linked to the Territorial Army, is being established to help guard certain important civilian and military installations in times of tension and war. Depending on the success of a pilot scheme this year, the force's strength could in time reach some 4,500.

Equipment

Following the 1981 defence review considerable progress is being made in bringing equipment procurement for the conventional forces into line with operational priorities and in securing better value for money. Expenditure on equipment in 1982-83, including associated personnel and other costs, will total £7,060 million, more than half the defence budget. Of this, about 74 per cent, some £5,218 million, will be spent on production (including £2,235 million on air equipment, £1,591 million on sea equipment and £1,068 million on land equipment) with the remainder on research and development.

The Royal Navy is in the middle of a major warship construction programme, with older and more manpower-intensive warships being phased out to make way for new types of destroyers and frigates now entering service or under construction. As a result the surface fleet will be smaller, but the new ships will be of advanced design and fitted with technologically sophisticated weapons and sensors. A construction programme for a simpler and cheaper type of frigate will begin later in the decade, and this, the Type 23, will reflect the policy of replacing ships rather than undertaking mid-life modernisation. The eighth Type 22 frigate has been ordered, while the Type 42 destroyer force is being built up to 14. The second anti-submarine warfare carrier, *Illustrious*, is expected to join the fleet soon and the construction of the third, *Ark Royal*, is progressing satisfactorily.[1] A final decision on a joint British-Italian successor to the Sea King is expected this year. The modernisation of the mine counter-measures force is well under way, the Hunt class entering service and feasibility studies for a similar type of minehunter being in hand. The expansion of the nuclear-powered submarine force is continuing (see pp 224-5). Weapon systems under construction or entering service include the Sting Ray lightweight torpedo, the air-launched anti-ship missile, Sea Skua, and the submarine-launched Sub-Harpoon. It has also been decided to acquire a new heavyweight torpedo, and the Sea Wolf air defence missile system is being upgraded.

[1]The decision to sell *Invincible* to Australia is being reviewed in discussions with the Australian Government.

Since May 1979 Blindfire Rapier missile systems, FH70 field howitzers, Milan anti-tank guided weapon systems and additional M109 self-propelled guns have all been deployed with BAOR. Lynx helicopters are being fitted with the TOW anti-tank guided weapon, while defence against opposing armour will increase with the introduction of the Challenger tank and improvements to Chieftain's firepower, the introduction of a new light anti-armour weapon (LAW80), and improved nightsights for the Milan and Swingfire anti-tank weapons. Artillery units will receive SP70 self-propelled howitzers and the Multiple Launch Rocket System, while low-level air defence will be further enhanced by the introduction of three batteries of tracked Rapier and continuing improvements to Rapier and Blowpipe. More vehicles will be provided to improve infantry mobility.

The Royal Air Force is undergoing the most comprehensive re-equipment programme for 30 years. It includes, in particular, an extensive programme for increasing the effectiveness and resilience of Britain's air defences. This, which will be completed by the end of the 1980s, includes major improvements to the United Kingdom Air Defence Ground Environment which will better equip the Royal Air Force in the vital fields of detection and data handling and processing; the entry into service in 1983 of the Nimrod airborne early warning aircraft and of the Tornado F2 in the mid-1980s; the retention of two Phantom squadrons instead of phasing them out as originally intended when the build-up of the Tornado is complete; the equipping, with short-range air-to-air missiles and guns, of 72 Hawk training aircraft for local air defence; and the introduction of the Sky Flash medium-range and the AIM 9L short-range air-to-air missiles. Blindfire Rapier is being built up for airfield and ground installation protection, and the Bloodhound surface-to-air missile is being improved.

The Royal Air Force's offensive capability will be greatly enhanced with the entry into service in 1982 of the Tornado GR1 and by Britain's decision to buy the Anglo-American improved Harrier, the AV8B. Despite the United States withdrawal from the project, Britain is continuing to develop the JP 233 airfield attack weapon. The decision to acquire the Sea Eagle air-to-surface missile will improve the Air Force's maritime capability, as will the Nimrod conversion programme, while air-to-air refuelling capability will be greatly increased by the VC10 tanker conversion programme. Other improvements include the introduction of the Chinook helicopter for battlefield support duties, and a programme to increase the load-carrying capability of 30 Hercules transport aircraft.

Conventional Forces Arms Control

Progress in the Vienna negotiations on Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions (MBFR), the White Paper notes, is still hampered by the East's reluctance to take a constructive approach to resolving the disagreement on the size of their forces and their refusal to accept effective verification measures, even though these would be equally applicable to the West. The draft agreement tabled by the East in February 1982 reveals no advance on its negative position with respect to these two crucial issues (see also p 231). Progress towards agreeing a mandate for a Conference on Disarmament in Europe at the Madrid Review Meeting of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe has been held up because of the violation of the Helsinki Final Act by the Soviet and Polish Governments at the end of 1981. Britain, however, remains committed to the objective of a European Disarmament Conference, and hopes that the obstacles to progress will have been removed by the time the Madrid meeting reconvenes in November. In April 1981 Britain was one of the first countries to sign the new convention to limit the use of certain particularly inhumane weapons (see p 370, 1980).

Beyond the NATO Area

The 1981 defence review, the White Paper recalls, reaffirmed Britain's intention to sustain and where appropriate expand its activities in the three areas in which defence resources can be brought to bear to protect Britain's essential interests worldwide, namely assistance to friendly states, peacetime deployments to strategically important areas and, in the last resort, intervention for deterrent or defensive purposes.

In 1981 military training was provided in Britain for some 3,400 students from non-NATO countries, together with 1,700 from within NATO, while in April 1982 some 660 military personnel were on loan to 26 countries. In Zimbabwe the British Military Advisory Training Team has completed the task of helping to form an integrated Zimbabwean National Army and is now assisting with further training, and Britain is contributing to the Commonwealth Training Team which is helping to train the Ugandan Army.

British deployments outside the NATO area continue to reflect its responsibility for the defence of its remaining dependencies, with forces stationed in Hong Kong, the Falkland Islands and the Caribbean, and its defence commitments to Belize (see p 215, 1981) and Brunei. Forces are also stationed in Cyprus, including Britain's contribution to the United Nations peacekeeping force there, and, since March 1982, in Sinai as part of the Multinational Force and Observers patrolling the Egyptian-Israeli border (see p 156). Exercises in 1981 included amphibious training in the Caribbean with units of the Netherlands and United States navies, battalion training in Kenya, and joint maritime exercises in Australia with the Australian, New Zealand and United States air forces.

Britain's capability for intervention includes Royal Navy ships, including the *Fearless* and *Intrepid* which it has been decided to retain, and an amphibious force of Royal Marines, while various types of transport, combat and reconnaissance aircraft can be called upon [as has been illustrated since the White Paper went to print by the operations in the Falkland Islands – see p 239]. The Spearhead battalion is always at 72 hours notice to deploy world-wide, with leading elements at 24 hours notice, and two battalions are fully trained for the parachute assault role.

Northern Ireland

In Northern Ireland the Services act in support of the Royal Ulster Constabulary (RUC) in maintaining law and order and combating terrorism. The expansion of the RUC, together with its increasing professionalism and growing capabilities, has led to a further decrease in the need for this support. The number of major units on emergency tours in the Province, therefore, has been reduced from four to three, bringing the total number of units there down to nine. For the first time since 1971 there are now fewer than 11,000 regular troops in the Province.

Military Aid to the Civilian Community

During 1981 the Services continued to assist the civil community in a variety of ways. During the winter, one of the worst on record, the Services responded to hundreds of requests for urgent assistance, ferrying seriously ill or injured people to hospital by helicopter or land vehicle, clearing snow-bound roads, relieving stranded vehicles and restoring communications. In the floods that followed snow before and after Christmas, servicemen strengthened flood barriers, evacuated many stranded people, ferried essential supplies and saved hundreds of farm animals. Other services provided on a regular basis included search and rescue operations by the Royal Navy and Royal Air Force helicopters which undertook 1,223 missions and rescued or assisted 858 people, and bomb disposal teams, particularly in Northern Ireland, which disarmed over 140 improvised devices and neutralising nearly 2,500 kg of explosives. At sea the Royal Navy's Fishery Protection Squadron and Royal Air Force Nimrods maintain a comprehensive surveillance of the 270,000 square miles of sea within Britain's fishery limits, at the same time keeping watch over Britain's offshore oil and gas installations. They are equipped to deal with incidents ranging from oil pollution to terrorism, calling on the Royal Marines if necessary. Hydrographic work conducted by the Royal Navy's Surveying Flotilla included surveys in the Indian Ocean, the Red Sea and the Caribbean.

EXPENDITURE

The defence budget estimates for 1982-83 total £14,091 which allows for a 3 per cent growth over 1981-82. As confirmed in the 1981 defence review, the Government is committed to implement in full the NATO aim of a 3 per cent annual real increase in defence spending up to and including 1985-86. In 1981 defence expenditure accounted for 4·9 per cent of Britain's gross domestic product, a proportion exceeded among the NATO countries only by Greece and the United States. Similarly, Britain was second after the United States in actual expenditure and third after the United States and France in *per capita* expenditure. A functional analysis of planned expenditure for 1982-83 is contained in the table.

THE MILITARY BALANCE

In surveying the East-West military balance the White Paper emphasises the need to take into account a variety of factors in addition to numbers of men and equipment, and in particular that of geography. The relative proximity of the Soviet Union to Central Europe compared with that of the United States – 450 miles and 3,000 miles respectively – affects the balance of both conventional and nuclear forces and creates significant problems in terms of arms control. While Soviet forces could reach deep into Western Europe from their peace-time bases and cover NATO targets with nuclear-capable aircraft and missiles of various ranges, United States forces – other than intercontinental or seaborne – have to be deployed overseas, or 'forward based', to reach Warsaw Pact territory. Moreover, the Warsaw Pact can transfer forces and support between

Functional Analysis of Expenditure and Manpower, 1982-83

	Expenditure (£ million)	Military personnel* (Thousands)	Civilian personnel* (Thousands)
Nuclear strategic force	327	2·4	4·5
Navy general purpose combat forces	1,861	29·7	6·9
European theatre ground forces	2,194	104·2	24·6
Other Army combat forces	41	14·7	6·9
Air Force general purpose forces	2,729	58·6	9·8
Reserve and auxiliary formations	287	3·0	3·0
Research and development	1,833	1·5	29·5
Training	1,162	67·8	18·6
Repair and associated facilities in Britain	869	10·7	73·9
War and contingency stocks	403	—	—
Other support functions	2,307	42·1	52·5
Miscellaneous expenditure and receipts	78	—	—
Total	14,091	334·7	230·2

*These are average strengths and include locally enlisted personnel, but exclude Ministry of Defence civilians employed in the Royal Ordnance Factories and Department of the Environment staff employed on defence work.

different theatres and concentrate its forces more easily than NATO, whose members are separated by ocean, seas and in some areas by the territory of other states.

Nuclear Forces

With respect to strategic forces, the White Paper notes that both the United States and the Soviet Union have continued to observe the provisions of the First Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT) and the initial limits on weapons set by the unratified SALT II agreement of 1979 (see p 187, 1979). The number of Soviet intermediate-range missile warheads deployed, however, has risen sharply, the number of SS20 missiles, each equipped with three warheads and having a range of some 3,000 miles, having risen from 120 at the end of 1980 to 190 at the end of March 1981. (This excludes a further 90 located in the Far East of the Soviet Union.) New shorter-range systems have also been introduced, the SS21, SS22 and SS23 missiles, which have ranges of up to 650 miles and which are all more effective and accurate than their predecessors. In contrast, the only NATO missiles in the same category are the Pershing I and Lance missiles, introduced in 1962 and 1973 respectively.

There is therefore a marked and growing disparity between East and West in Europe, the White Paper continues, Soviet claims of nuclear parity in Europe being based on selective exclusion of its own systems compared with NATO's. (For example, its figures appear to include NATO aircraft like the F4 but exclude such Soviet aircraft as the Flogger, Fitter and Fencer which have a similar capability.) Comparing systems of broadly equivalent operational capability, the balance of longer-range delivery systems in Europe – of especial importance because they can reach targets in Western Europe from bases in the Soviet Union, and vice versa – stands at about 840 Soviet missiles and aircraft and 200 NATO aircraft, a ratio of more than four to one in the Soviet Union's favour. The ratio of intermediate-range nuclear warheads is also at least four to one in the Soviet Union's favour when broadly similar operational capabilities are compared.

Conventional Forces

Turning to the balance of conventional forces in Europe the White Paper says that the evidence again shows a preponderance in favour of the Soviet Union, both in manpower (of 1·2 to 1 in both total numbers and of soldiers in fighting units) and in most categories of armament (of 2·9, 2·5 and 2·2 to 1 in artillery, main battle tanks and fixed-wing tactical aircraft respectively). In addition, it estimates that the Soviet Union has a stockpile in excess of 300,000 tonnes of chemical warfare agent. In contrast, the United States, the only NATO country to have chemical weapons (though these are not declared to NATO) has not produced, nor filled any new munitions with any chemicals since 1969. The United States, however, has recently announced a modernisation programme and the British Government hopes that this will encourage the Soviet Union to negotiate seriously for a complete ban on the production and stockpiling of these weapons.

The situation at sea has become increasingly adverse in recent years, the White Paper comments. Unlike the Warsaw Pact with its largely internal lines of communication for reinforcement and re-supply, the NATO Allies are dependent on the free use of the sea. The Warsaw Pact also benefits from the largely centralised command and control of its naval forces, unlike NATO; and, although its naval forces are handicapped by long access routes from Murmansk and by the 'choke' points created by the Baltic and Turkish straits, they would have the initiative in time and place if they chose to interdict NATO's sea communications. In these circumstances, the White Paper states, the defending side would need a substantial overall numerical superiority. This NATO once had, but no longer. Indeed, in submarines, shore-based anti-surface ship attack aircraft, long-range missiles and offensive mines the Warsaw Pact is stronger, and substantially so in the last three categories. More particularly, in the crucial Eastern Atlantic area, to which most British maritime forces are committed, the Warsaw Pact is superior to NATO in submarines (2 to 1) maritime aircraft (1·4 to 1) and offensive mines (31 to 1), and has more than two-thirds the number of NATO's surface vessels.

ARMS CONTROL AND SECURITY

Arms control – the limitation and reduction of forces by both East and West – is a fundamental part of Britain's defence policy, the White Paper states in a separate essay entitled *Arms Control and Security*. The ultimate goal, as Britain endorsed in the Final Document of the First United Nations Special Session on Disarmament in 1978 (see p 233), is general disarmament to a level of national forces sufficient only to ensure internal law and order. However, since disarmament at a stroke is impracticable in a world of deep political divisions, what is required is a careful step-by-step approach, in which no state should be able to gain an advantage over another at any stage in the disarmament process. In addition arms control cannot be considered in isolation from the general political climate, and the relentless build-up of Soviet armaments in recent years – at a time when the West was reducing its own – and events in places like Angola, Cambodia, Afghanistan and, lately, Poland have seriously undermined Western confidence in Soviet good faith. This has not helped progress in arms control in recent years.

To meet the basic requirement of enhancing security any arms control measure has to be balanced, militarily significant and verifiable. In the case of each of these essential criteria, however, the White Paper states that the attitude of the Soviet Union and its allies presents major obstacles.

Balance

The Warsaw Pact has a substantial advantage over NATO in almost every respect. Any agree-

ment which reduced the level of forces but left intact this superiority (for example by equal numerical reductions) would weaken, rather than enhance, NATO's security by increasing the ratio in favour of the Warsaw Pact. This problem lies at the heart of the continuing deadlock in the Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions negotiations. The Alliance is convinced that the East has an advantage of over 150,000 troops in Central Europe. The Warsaw Pact denies this, claiming that rough parity already exists, but refuses to enter into serious discussions to resolve the discrepancy between Western and Eastern figures.

Militarily Significant Measures

Many Soviet initiatives, the White Paper continues, are essentially designed for propaganda purposes, involving sweeping declarations which emphasise the peaceful intentions of the Soviet Union but are of no practical significance. A recent United Nations draft resolution on *Urgent Measures for Reducing the Dangers of War* was tabled by the Soviet Union only 10 months after the invasion of Afghanistan. Furthermore, the Soviet Union is not prepared to back up rhetoric with practical action. Thus, having tabled a proposal for a general 10 per cent reduction in military expenditure, the Soviet Union refuses to provide any credible figures for its military spending. Similarly, the Eastern bloc's poor record of implementation of the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act – most recently demonstrated in Poland – underlines the need for measures to be binding on all parties. That is why the West has insisted in the Madrid Review Meeting that a follow-up Conference on Disarmament in Europe must have a mandate to negotiate measures that are both militarily significant and binding.

Verification

The problem of verification is perhaps the most significant. Although compliance can sometimes be satisfactorily confirmed by external monitoring (for example using satellites), most measures can only be verified by direct observation on the territory of the State concerned. The Soviet Union, however, has been reluctant to accept the kind of inspection measures which the West thinks necessary (see p 235). The importance of adequate verification is illustrated by the outbreak of anthrax in Sverdlovsk in 1979. Although the 1972 Biological Weapons Convention provides for international consultation to take place to reassure all signatories that no breach of the Convention has occurred, the Soviet authorities have been unwilling to give a satisfactory explanation of the outbreak. They have, moreover, resisted all efforts to improve the procedures for ensuring compliance with the Convention.

Britain's Commitment

Despite these difficulties, Britain still believes in the importance of agreeing real limitations and reductions in the opposing armed forces, the White Paper's essay concludes, and sees the four-point proposal announced by the United States in November 1981 as offering a major opportunity for progress (see pp 359-61). Together with its Allies, it will continue to work for agreements which meet the three criteria described, and do all it can to convince the Warsaw Pact countries that this is the best way to a real and lasting peace.

NATO Heads of Government Meeting

Meeting in Bonn on 10 June, the heads of Government of the 16 members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) reaffirmed their dedication to the shared values and ideals of their partnership, which had preserved peace in Europe for 35 years, and welcomed the accession of Spain. Separate documents were issued giving the Alliance position on arms control and disarmament and on integrated NATO defence.

DECLARATION BY MEMBER STATES

Heads of Government said that the Alliance, an association of free nations joined together to preserve their security through mutual guarantees and collective self-defence, remained 'the essential instrument for deterring aggression by means of a strong defence and strengthening peace by means of constructive dialogue'. It was a partnership of equals and members were prepared to adjust their aims and interests through free and close consultations. In contrast the Soviet Union required its allies to act as a bloc in order to preserve a rigid and imposed system. Experience also showed that, as in Afghanistan and Poland, it was willing 'to threaten or use force beyond its own frontiers', while devoting a large part of its resources to a massive military build-up 'far exceeding its defence needs and supporting the projection of military power on a global scale'. Although creating a threat of these dimensions, the Soviet Union, together with its Warsaw Pact allies, condemned Western defence efforts to meet this as aggressive and, while banning unilateral disarmament movements in their own countries, supported demands in the West for unilateral disarmament. Greater restraint and responsibility by the Soviet Union would be required if international stability and peace were to be maintained.

Programme for Peace in Freedom

Setting out a programme for peace in freedom, member states said: 'Our purpose is to prevent war and, while safeguarding democracy, to build the foundations of lasting peace. None of our weapons will ever be used except in response to attack. We respect the sovereignty, equality, independence and territorial integrity of all states. In fulfilment of our purpose, we shall maintain adequate military strength and political solidarity. On that basis, we will persevere in efforts to establish, whenever Soviet behaviour makes this possible, a more constructive East-West relationship through dialogue, negotiation and mutually advantageous co-operation.'

The security of the North Atlantic area required adequate nuclear and conventional forces to deter aggression and intimidation and 'a sustained effort on the part of all the Allies to improve their defence readiness and military capabilities without seeking military superiority'. The presence of North American armed forces in Europe and the United States strategic nuclear commitment to Europe remained 'integral to Allied security', as did the maintenance and continued improvement of the defence capabilities of the European member states. Heads of Government promised therefore to seek 'to achieve greater effectiveness in the application of national resources to defence, giving due attention to possibilities for developing areas of practical co-operation' and to explore urgently ways to take full advantage of emerging technologies. At the same time steps would be taken 'to restrict Warsaw Pact access to Western militarily relevant technology'.

Confirming their aim to have a stable balance of forces at the lowest possible level, member states said that they had 'initiated a comprehensive series of proposals for militarily significant, equitable and verifiable agreements on the control and reduction of armaments' and fully supported 'the efforts of the United States to negotiate with the Soviet Union for substantial reductions in the strategic nuclear weapons of the two countries and for the establishment of strict and effective limitations on their intermediate-range nuclear weapons, starting with the total elimination of their land-based intermediate-range missiles'. In addition they promised to continue to seek 'substantial reductions of conventional forces on both sides in Europe and to reach agreement on measures which will serve to build confidence and enhance security in the whole of Europe'. A new initiative had been agreed to give fresh impetus to the Vienna negotiations on mutual and balanced force reductions and member states promised to play an active part in wider international talks on arms control and disarmament and to give new momentum to these talks at the United Nations Second Special Session on Disarmament (see p 233).

The declaration stressed the need to develop substantial and balanced East-West relations aimed at genuine détente. 'For this to be achieved', it continued, 'the sovereignty of all states . . . must be respected, human rights must not be sacrificed to state interests, the free movement of ideas must take the place of one-sided propaganda, the free movement of persons must be made possible, efforts must be made to achieve a military relationship characterised by stability and openness and . . . all principles and provisions of the Helsinki Final Act in their entirety must be applied.' The Alliance would always be ready to negotiate in this spirit and looked for tangible evidence that this attitude would be reciprocated.

Noting that all member states had an interest in peace and security in regions outside Europe, the declaration reaffirmed the Alliance's commitment to peaceful progress world-wide, including efforts to remove the causes of instability and support the struggle against hunger and poverty, and recognised that respect for genuine non-alignment was important for international stability. They promised to consult together on events in those regions which had implications for their security, and those members in a position to do so would 'endeavour to respond to requests for assistance from sovereign states whose security and independence [was] threatened'.

On economic problems the declaration said that inflation had to be curbed in order that there could be a return to sustained growth and high levels of employment. It also pointed out that economic relations with the Warsaw Pact countries should be conducted on the basis of a balanced advantage for both sides, and said that member states would 'manage financial relations with the Warsaw Pact countries on a sound economic basis, including commercial prudence . . . in the granting of export credits'.

Berlin and German Unity

The declaration emphasised the Alliance's commitment to maintain the security and freedom of Berlin and, recalling that the rights and responsibilities of the Four Powers[1] relating to Berlin and Germany as a whole remained unaffected, confirmed support for the efforts made by the Federal Republic of Germany to improve relations between the two German states and to work towards a state of peace in Europe in which the German people would regain its unity through self-determination.

Terrorism

In conclusion, the declaration condemned all acts of international terrorism as 'flagrant violations of human dignity and rights' and 'a threat to the conduct of normal international relations', and stressed the need for effective co-operation in preventing and suppressing it.

ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT

In a separate document, the Alliance calls on the Soviet Union to agree to significant reductions in strategic nuclear forces and says that the United States proposal for the elimination of all longer range land-based intermediate-range missiles holds promise 'for an equitable outcome and enhanced security for all' (see pp 359-61, 1981).

At the Vienna talks on mutual and balanced force reductions, the document confirms, those NATO members taking part will soon present a draft treaty embodying a new proposal which, if accepted, would result in substantial manpower reductions leading to equal collective ceilings for Eastern and Western forces in Central Europe, based on agreed data, with associated measures designed to strengthen confidence and enhance verification. It also states that the proposal for a Conference on Confidence-building Measures and Disarmament in Europe as part of a balanced outcome of the Madrid Meeting on Security and Co-operation in Europe (see pp 351-5, 1980) would 'open the way to increased transparency and enhanced stability in the whole of Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals'.

[1]The United States, Britain, France and the Soviet Union.

The document commits the Allies to work actively in the Committee on Disarmament to obtain equitable and verifiable arms control agreements, including a total ban on chemical weapons. In addition it hopes that the United Nations Special Session on Disarmament will give new impetus to negotiations by promoting military openness and verification, reaffirm the need for strict observance of the principle of renunciation of force enshrined in the United Nations Charter, and strengthen compliance with existing arms control agreements.

In conclusion the Allies appeal to all states to co-operate in efforts to strengthen peace and security and called on the Soviet Union 'to translate its professed commitment to disarmament into active steps aimed at achieving concrete, balanced and verifiable results at the negotiating table'.

INTEGRATED NATO DEFENCE

In the document on NATO's integrated defence structure, the Allies state their intention to strengthen their defences with special regard to conventional forces. In particular they commit themselves to improving the readiness of their standing forces and the readiness and mobilisation of reserve forces, enhancing overall defence capabilities, improving Alliance planning procedures, and exploring ways of achieving greater effectiveness in the application of national resources to defence. In addition attention will continue to be given to fair sharing of the burdens of defence expenditure and to possibilities for developing areas of practical co-operation from which all members of the Alliance could benefit. The Allies also commit themselves to explore ways of taking full advantage of emerging technologies, especially to improve conventional defence, and to take steps to restrict the transfer of militarily relevant technology to the Warsaw Pact.

The document, referring to developments beyond the NATO area, reaffirms the Allies' 'need to consult with a view to sharing assessments and identifying common objectives, taking full account of the effect on NATO security and defence capability, as well as of the national interests of member countries'. It concludes: 'Recognising that the policies which nations adopt in this field are a matter for national decision, we agree to examine collectively . . . the requirements which may arise for the defence of the NATO area as a result of deployments by individual member states outside that area. Steps which may be taken by individual Allies in the light of such consultations to facilitate possible military deployments beyond the NATO area can represent an important contribution to Western security.'

United Nations Special Session on Disarmament

Britain's commitments to peace with freedom and justice and to the defence of its people were reaffirmed by the Prime Minister, Mrs Margaret Thatcher, in a speech delivered to the Second United Nations Special Session on Disarmament on 23 June.

The Second Special Session took place in New York from 7 June to 10 July, attended by Britain and over 150 other countries. It discussed matters relating to disarmament and security, and reviewed progress made since the First Special Session in 1978. Britain was closely involved in the work of the 78-nation preparatory committee, and, together with Australia, Belgium, the Federal Republic of Germany and Japan, tabled in July 1981 draft proposals for a comprehensive programme of disarmament.

In a parliamentary reply on 13 July (*Hansard*, Vol 27, No 152, written answers, col 356), the Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary, Mr Francis Pym, said that the Special Session had not been able to agree on the main issues before it, namely a review of progress since 1978 and a comprehensive programme of disarmament. Britain, however, believed that the discussions had been helpful in increasing understanding of the issues. Priority should now be given to making progress on important negotiations elsewhere, such as those on intermediate-range nuclear forces, strategic arms reductions, mutual and balanced force reductions, and a convention banning chemical weapons.

Background

The First United Nations Special Session on Disarmament took place in 1978 when a Final Document was agreed by consensus setting out the goals of arms control and disarmament negotiations and defining the principles on which measures should be based (see pp 286-8, 1978). The ultimate objective was stated to be general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control, the priorities being effective methods of nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war, the prohibition of other weapons of mass destruction, and balanced reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments. It endorsed the views, shared by Britain and other Western nations, that the aim throughout the disarmament process should be undiminished security at the lowest possible level of armaments and military forces, and that agreements should provide for adequate measures of verification satisfactory to all parties in order to create the necessary confidence and ensure that they are being observed by all parties.

The First Special Session's most important results stemmed from the Final Document's concluding section on disarmament machinery. Following a British initiative, the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament was reformed and expanded to become the 40-nation Committee on Disarmament which is the main multilateral negotiating body for arms control and disarmament measures and which, unlike its predecessor, includes all five nuclear-weapon states.

Although critical of some aspects of the Final Document, particularly the insufficient emphasis on conventional disarmament and on measures to

prevent nuclear proliferation, Britain recognised the Special Session's importance in promoting awareness of the need for disarmament, welcomed the adoption of its proposals to reform disarmament machinery, and reaffirmed its commitment to the multilateral negotiation of balanced and verifiable arms control agreements.

One of the tasks of the Second Special Session will be to consider a Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament. Britain's proposals for this are contained in the five-nation Western draft programme tabled in the Committee on Disarmament in July 1981. This sets out the measures needed to reach the goal of general and complete disarmament; it does not, however, propose a fixed timetable or assign specific negotiations to particular phases beyond the first. The main objective of the latter would be the completion of all negotiations currently in progress or in prospect. These include, among the measures of nuclear disarmament, substantial reductions in the strategic arsenals of the superpowers, the progressive limitation of intermediate-range nuclear forces in Europe, and measures to strengthen the non-proliferation regime; among steps toward conventional disarmament, they include mutual and balanced force reductions in Europe and a treaty banning chemical weapons. Thereafter measures for subsequent stages would be selected during review conferences in the light of progress achieved and the prevailing international climate. The draft also emphasises the need for negotiations to concentrate on specific proposals, the importance of adequate verification measures to ensure the undiminished security of participating states during the disarmament process, and the need for associated confidence-building measures.

Prime Minister's Speech

Defining disarmament as the balanced and verifiable reduction of armaments in a manner designed to enhance peace and security, Mrs Thatcher said that, although this was the stated purpose of the Special Session, the underlying and more important purpose was peace with freedom and justice – not peace at any price. If arms control helped to achieve the central aims of preserving peace and enabling the peoples of each sovereign state to lead their lives as they chose within established borders, it had to be pursued vigorously. 'But if it is carried out in a way which damages peace we must resist it', Mrs Thatcher added, for 'there have been occasions when the known or perceived military weakness of an opponent has been at least as potent a cause of war as military strength.'

Deterrence

The Prime Minister said that the march of modern technology had made the weapons of war ever more deadly, especially nuclear weapons with their terrifying destructive power. The world, however alarmed by these weapons, could not disinvent them nor cancel the knowledge of how to make them. Nuclear weapons had to be seen as deterrents, for there would be no victory in a nuclear exchange and the starting of a war among nuclear powers was not a rational option. 'These weapons succeed in so far as they prevent war. And for thirty-seven years nuclear weapons have kept the peace between East and West. That is a priceless achievement. Provided there is the will and good sense, deterrence can be maintained at substantially reduced levels of nuclear weapons.' Although the world had to look for a better system of preventing war than nuclear deterrence, it would be a 'perilous pretence' to suggest that there was such a system within reach at the present time. The Prime Minister continued: 'The task is to harness the existence of nuclear weapons to the service of peace. . . . In that task the duty of the nuclear powers is to show restraint and responsibility. The distinctive role of the non-nuclear countries . . . is to recognise that proliferation of nuclear weapons cannot be the way to a safer world.'

Conventional Weapons

Turning to the problem of conventional weapons, Mrs Thatcher said that, although nuclear weapons had to remain a major concern of the Special Session, it should not be overlooked that there had been some 140 conflicts since 1945, which had been fought with conventional weapons, and in which up to 10 million people had died. Although nuclear war was a terrible threat, conventional war was a terrible reality. 'If we deplore the amount of military spending in a world where so many go hungry and so much else needs to be done, our criticism and our action should turn above all to conventional forces which absorb up to 90 per cent of military spending world-wide.' There was a need for a deeper and wider effort in the non-nuclear field to see what could be done to lighten the risks, the burdens and the fears.

Risks to Peace

The fundamental risk to peace, the Prime Minister continued, was not the existence of weapons of particular types but 'the disposition on the part of some states to impose change on others by resorting to force'. The key need was not promises against first use of this or that kind of weapon, but 'a credible assurance, if such can ever be obtained, against starting military action at all'. The leaders of the North Atlantic Alliance had given a solemn collective undertaking that none of their weapons would ever be used except in response to attack (see p 231). Mrs Thatcher added: 'Let us face the reality. The springs of war lie in the readiness to resort to force against other nations, and not in "arms races", whether real or imaginary. Aggressors do not start wars because an adversary has built up his own strength. They start wars because they believe they can gain more by going to war than by remaining at peace. Few, if any, of the 140 conflicts since 1945 can be traced to an arms race.' The causes that had produced war in the past had not disappeared. 'The lesson is that disarmament and good intentions on their own do not ensure peace.'

Noting that there was a natural revulsion in democratic societies against war and that it was preferable to see arms build-ups prevented by good sense, persuasion or agreement, Mrs Thatcher said that if this did not work the owners

of vast armouries could not be allowed to imagine that they could use them with impunity. Mere words, speeches and resolutions would not prevent them, and Britain's security and that of its friends could 'be ensured only by deterrence and by adequate strength – adequate when compared with that of a potential aggressor'.

Arms Control

In making these points, Mrs Thatcher continued, she did not intend to decry disarmament and arms control – believing in them both – but to make clear what they could and could not achieve. Arms control alone could not remove the possibility of war. Nevertheless, the limitation and reduction of armaments could still do a great deal by reducing the economic burden of military preparation for legitimate self-defence, diminishing the inhumanity of conflict, restricting the military use of advancing science and technology, easing the tension between states, and lessening the fears of people everywhere. 'To do these things, and to do them in a way that is balanced, verifiable and dependable, is worth sustained and persistent endeavour.'

The Prime Minister pointed out that, while critics too often played down the achievements of arms control agreements, there had been a number of agreements such as those on outer space, the sea bed, Antarctica, the partial Test Ban Treaty, the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and the various Geneva accords on strategic nuclear weapons. Britain had been among the architects of some of these successes and had contributed substantially to the banning of biological and toxin weapons in 1972. Although a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty had not been signed and the recent review of the non-proliferation treaty had been unproductive (see pp 266-8, 1980), it was wrong to suggest that what had been done so far was insignificant. There was a useful foundation upon which to build and states needed to go a stage further.

Measures For the Future

On nuclear weapons, the Prime Minister said that the hopes of the world rested on direct talks between the United States and the Soviet Union, who had by far the largest arsenals. These could be greatly reduced in a way which would not endanger security, and decisive action was necessary, not just declarations or freezes. Mrs Thatcher welcomed the proposals made by the United States for a substantial cut in strategic weapons and the elimination of intermediate-range systems (the zero option – see pp 359-60, 1981). The negotiations needed the wholehearted support of all nations.

Britain was also deeply concerned about the dangers of chemical warfare. In 1972, when the world community banned the possession of biological and toxin weapons, it was hoped that corresponding action would follow on chemical weapons, but this had not happened. There was reason also to doubt whether every country which had signed the 1972 treaty was observing it. There had been disquieting and well-documented reports, which urgently needed investigation, that chemical weapons and toxins had been used in some countries in Asia.[1] The Committee on Disarmament needed to give renewed and determined impetus to a properly verifiable convention banning development and possession of such weapons.

Turning to conventional weapons and forces, Mrs Thatcher observed that their biggest concentration and confrontation lay in Europe, heavily weighted on the side of the Warsaw Pact. Although in itself a cause of concern, the more fundamental question was whether the Warsaw Pact could or wished to sustain a stable relationship with the rest of the world. The events in Poland (see pp 7-12) revealed 'deep disillusion within the Soviet empire', and those in Afghanistan (see pp 15-18, 1980) demonstrated 'the Soviet propensity to extend its frontiers'. Both were evidence of an underlying instability. Thus, the need to secure a better balance in conventional arms was imperative. Talks on mutual and balanced force reductions in central Europe had been pursued patiently in Vienna for the past nine years, and Mrs Thatcher hoped that some progress would be made following new proposals made by the West (see p 232). Britain also wanted a special effort made to agree on new mandatory confidence- and security-building measures in Europe (see pp 351-5, 1980) which would be a valuable complement to action in Vienna on force levels.

Observing that the critical factor of verification ran through all these negotiations, the Prime Minister emphasised that, where national security was at stake, agreements could not be taken on trust, especially when some states were so secretive and such closed societies. 'Agreements which cannot be verified can be worse than useless – they can be a new source of danger, fear and mistrust. Verification is not an optional extra in disarmament and arms control. It is the heart of the matter.' Although differences over verification had often proved a stumbling block in arms control negotiations, Mrs Thatcher noted that the Soviet Union was now prepared to open part of its civil nuclear installations to inspection by the International Atomic Energy Agency – a step taken by Britain years ago – and that it seemed ready to accept the need for systematic on-site inspection in respect of a chemical weapons treaty. Efforts needed to be redoubled to bridge the gaps that still remained.

In conclusion the Prime Minister said: 'Britain's record over the years in work on disarmament and arms control stands up to any comparison. We wish to do more – not by rhetoric, still less by propaganda postures, but by steady, relevant work going step by step through these difficult and complex matters . . . . There is no short cut if we are to retain security and peace. These are the considerations which I suggest the Special Session needs to have in mind in considering a comprehensive programme of disarmament and in its review of progress since the First Special Session.' Britain's message was practical and realistic: 'It

[1]Reports on the use of chemical weapons in Afghanistan and in South East Asia are currently the subject of inquiries by the United Nations.

contains nought of comfort to those who seek only a quiet life for themselves at the expense of the freedom of others, nor to those who wish to impose their will by force.' Britain believed in the defence of the human values of civilisation, the upholding of international law and the United Nations Charter, balanced and verifiable disarmament where it could be the servant of peace and freedom, secure defence as the best safeguard of peace, and the creation of greater stability through a balanced reduction in conventional weapons. Britain also believed that the purpose of nuclear weapons should be to prevent war and that this could be achieved by smaller armouries. Finally, Mrs Thatcher said that wars were not caused by armaments but the ambitions of aggressors and that Britain had the right and the duty to defend its people wherever and whenever its liberty was challenged.

[For further information on the Special Session, see COI reference paper No 162/82, *Britain and the UN Special Session on Disarmament*.]

European Community

The economic and social situation within the European Community and its economic relations with the United States were among the topics discussed by the European Council in Brussels on 28 and 29 June. The Community's relations with Latin America and the crisis in Lebanon were also considered. Britain's views on Federal German and Italian proposals regarding European union were set out in the House of Commons on 17 June.

EUROPEAN COUNCIL

Prime Minister's Statement

Reporting to the House of Commons on 1 July (*Hansard*, Vol 26, No 144, cols 1041–9) the Prime Minister, Mrs Margaret Thatcher, said that the meeting had been dominated by external problems and that agreed texts had been issued on the hostilities in the Middle East (for the Community's statement on Lebanon, see pp 243-4), economic relations with the United States, and the Community's economic and social situation.

On the Middle East Mrs Thatcher said that the member states shared intense concern at the situation in Lebanon and had stressed the need to preserve a ceasefire in order to secure disengagement of forces in and around Beirut and full implementation of recent resolutions of the United Nations Security Council (see pp 196–7). In the broader Arab-Israel context the participants 'continued to see no alternative to negotiations between the parties, based on the two fundamental principles of the Venice declaration: security for all states, including Israel, and justice for all peoples, including the Palestinian people'.

Referring to economic relations with the United States, the Prime Minister said that the Council's discussion reflected concern about certain decisions taken by the United States Government[1]: 'Their actions in respect of steel imports and the Siberian gas pipeline could have serious consequences which everyone in the Community wants to avoid. The European Council agreed that representatives of the Community should immediately contact the responsible authorities in the United States to see if an acceptable solution could be found.' Answering questions, she said that an Order had been made on 30 June under the Protection of Trading Interests Act 1980 so that British firms adversely affected by the United States measures could make representations to the Department of Trade.

Mrs Thatcher said that discussion on the economic and social situation in the Community had been relatively brief since it had already been agreed that industrial questions and unemployment would be a major theme at the Council meeting to be held in December in Copenhagen.

Commenting on enlargement of the Community, the Prime Minister said that negotiations with Spain and Portugal would continue and that the Commission would propose solutions to the outstanding problems. Britain wanted the negotiations to succeed as soon as possible and would continue to work towards that objective.

Economic Relations with the United States

The Council agreed that it was in the interests of the world economy to adhere to the lines of policy agreed at the recent Versailles conference (see pp 201–3) and considered that 'a lowering of interest rates was a prerequisite for the recovery of the world economy'. Referring to recent United States decisions relating to steel imports and to the export and licensing of equipment for the Siberian gas pipeline, the Council emphasised that the maintenance of the open world trade system would be seriously jeopardised by 'unilateral and retroactive decisions on international trade, attempts to exercise extra-territorial legal powers, and measures which [prevented] the fulfilment of existing trade contracts'. It expressed concern at these recent developments and called for a genuine and effective dialogue between the Community and the United States.

Latin America

The European Council confirmed the importance it attached to the development of relations with the peoples of Latin America, and instructed ministers to study appropriate ways of strengthening co-operation between the Community and Latin American countries. It also requested the Com-

[1]On 11 June the United States, claiming that there was evidence that some steel imports from Western Europe were being subsidised illegally, imposed countervailing duties. The Community has not accepted the basis on which these calculations have been made nor the outcome of those calculations in terms of the duties imposed. On 18 June the United States Administration extended its December 1981 ban on the export of US manufactured equipment to the Soviet Union for the planned natural gas pipeline between Siberia and Western Europe. The original ban, imposed as a sanction against the proclamation of martial law in Poland (see p 10), now covers equipment produced by subsidiaries of United States companies abroad, or produced abroad under licences from such companies.

munity's institutions to pursue actively a study concerning aid to Central America and discussed means of helping, with the agreement of the countries concerned, to reduce tension and to promote peace in the region.

Economic and Social Situation

The European Council said that it 'confirmed the conclusions reached in March (see p 112) regarding a co-ordinated policy for combating unemployment by promoting productive investment, increasing competitiveness and productivity as well as the development of a Community industrial strategy based on a technology and innovation policy'. The Council called upon member states to take account of the priority to be given to developing investment when formulating economic and budgetary policies, and looked forward to proposals from the Commission concerning the development of new technologies. This, however, would be a vain hope unless Governments managed to convince 'public opinion, economic circles and both sides of industry of the need to transfer resources in favour of both public and private productive investment'. Finally the Council requested ministers of finance, economic affairs and social affairs to adopt firm decisions in November regarding specific measures to combat unemployment, particularly in the case of young people. (For some British measures, see p 248.)

EUROPEAN UNION

The Federal German and Italian proposals on European union were discussed in the House of Commons on 17 June. Their purpose is to reaffirm the Community's treaty commitment to the objective of European union, as endorsed by heads of Government meetings in 1972 and 1974, and to provide for a number of practical improvements in the operation of the Community in ways which do not involve treaty amendment or changes in the powers of the institutions as laid down in the treaties. The text of the original proposals, submitted to the European Council in November 1981 (see p 358, 1981), has been revised following discussions between member states, and a document containing the revised text was submitted to Parliament in early June.

Government View

Opening the debate (*Hansard*, Vol 25, No 134, cols 1101–42), Mr Douglas Hurd, Minister of State at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, said that while the Government welcomed the general approach of the document, work remained to be done on several of the proposals and Britain had reservations which had not yet been taken into account. In the Government's view union was 'not a commitment to a federal system or to the progressive erosion of national sovereignty' but 'the development of an ever closer framework of co-operation between the sovereign states of the Community in all areas of their activity where this co-operation [could] be shown to be useful'. European union would therefore 'be based on work already undertaken within the treaties and on political co-operation, which [was] concerned with co-ordinating foreign policy'. It would not mean 'the creation of any new institution or increases in the formal powers of existing institutions'. Neither the original nor the revised proposals under consideration would involve treaty amendment or changes in the powers of institutions as laid down in the treaties, a principle that the British Government had emphasised from the outset and which had been accepted by the other member states. One of the most important paragraphs in the section on objectives, proposed by Britain, was the reaffirmation that 'respect for and maintenance of representative democracy and human rights in each member state are essential elements of membership of the European Communities'.

Decision-making Procedures

Mr Hurd said that Britain agreed with the aim of promoting greater coherence and co-ordination by making decision-making procedures more efficient. He noted that the composition of the European Council (heads of State or Government, foreign ministers, the President of the European Commission and another member of the Commission) and its functions were reaffirmed and that provision was made for the President of the Council of Ministers to appear before the European Parliament at least once during each (six monthly) Presidency. The Prime Minister had set an example here when she had addressed the Parliament during Britain's Presidency in 1981 (see p 3). Britain, continued Mr Hurd, was also ready to accept that the Council of Ministers should deal with both Community business and political co-operation on foreign policy (see pp 326–7, 1981).

Turning to the question of decision taking, Mr Hurd recalled that Britain's insistence on the need for unanimity in the Agriculture Council in May (see pp 192–3) had been set aside by a majority of other member states. The minister explained that the Treaty of Rome had laid down certain areas where decisions had to be taken unanimously and certain others where majority voting was to be the rule. He continued: 'Nothing that has happened, and nothing in this document, affects those articles of the Treaty which require unanimity. They are in the Treaty. No one has suggested that there should be anything other than unanimous voting on the matters covered by those articles. However, since the Luxembourg compromise in 1966, it has been the practice that decisions in other areas – those covered under the Treaty by majority voting – are not taken by majority vote where a member state makes it clear that important national interests are involved. The Government have never been opposed to the proper use of majority voting where the treaties provide for it. Indeed, greater use of majority voting can help to speed up Community business in a way that can be useful. We attach importance to the safeguards . . . against the overriding of important national interests provided by the Luxembourg compromise. It was that safeguard that was wrongly overruled on 18 May, and that we would like to see restored.' In considering any ideas relating to

majority voting, the Government would be guided by the view that it was essential for member states to be the judge of whether or not an important national interest was at stake, and that this principle would have to be made clear in any text on European union. This would not be easy since a number of member states had never accepted the Luxembourg compromise: 'They have always made their objection to it clear, although for 16 years they allowed it to be the convention under which decisions were taken in those parts of the Community's work. Therefore, it has always been an agreement to disagree, and that makes it particularly difficult to put together again. It had not prevented it working as a procedure until last month, and it is how things work that matters to us.'

Political Co-operation

A great deal of progress had been made on political co-operation, Mr Hurd said, especially under the British Presidency (see pp 326–7, 1981) and Britain wanted to persevere with it.

Institutions

Referring to proposals for ministerial meetings on culture, justice and other areas, Mr Hurd expressed opposition to the setting up of new Councils but accepted the idea of occasional meetings when necessary. Although the document provided for improvements in the Parliament's relations with the Council of Ministers and the Commission, Mr Hurd said that it did not involve any increases in its powers. The Parliament's right to deliberate on all matters relating to the Community was reaffirmed, as was its right to submit written or oral questions to the Council and the Commission. In addition, the text provided for the Council to give reasons for departing from an opinion of the Parliament required under the treaties. Britain did not consider that the Council or the foreign ministers 'should be obliged to explain their reasons for not taking account of parliamentary resolutions which [were] not required under the treaties'. Nor did it believe that there was a case for increasing the formal powers of the Parliament; it was, however, prepared to accept that the Parliament should be informed on a confidential basis about the progress of negotiations on all the Community's important international agreements. (Under present arrangements an informal practice has developed of informing the Parliament on a confidential basis about the progress of negotiations on trade agreements.)

Commenting on the proposal that there should be more frequent delegation of powers to the Commission within the framework of the treaties, Mr Hurd recalled that successive British Governments had always been prepared to consider this on a case-by-case basis, for example, in managing the Community's regional development fund.

Policies

The Minister also welcomed the document's emphasis on the development of policies outside agriculture as had been agreed in the mandate guidelines following the budget agreement of 30 May 1980 (see pp 182-3, 1980). Only in this way could the problem of unacceptable budgetary situations be resolved. On financing Community policies, the British Government maintained its position that the 1 per cent ceiling (see p 195) should not be increased for this acted 'as a brake on the unlimited expansion of Community expenditure'.

Discussing the question of approximation of laws, Mr Hurd said that, although there had been some foolish proposals in this area, it was increasingly recognised that it was sensible and in the interests of British industry 'to seek to reduce the non-tariff barriers to trade and bring about a coming together of technical standards'. The Government supported this principle since it did not want trade 'constantly interrupted or reduced due to arguments about standards or non-tariff barriers'. On the approximation of laws in areas outside the Treaty, Mr Hurd said that this section of the document was worded in general terms and committed member states to 'no more than approximation on a case-by-case basis where it [seemed] to be desirable'. Although this part of the text was for the most part acceptable, Britain did not see what benefit could be achieved from an increased approximation of criminal law given the 'fundamental and continuing difference' between the British and Continental legal systems.

Conclusion

Like some other members, Mr Hurd said, Britain was not prepared to accept a commitment to a future treaty and wanted progress towards European union to be 'pragmatic and evolutionary'. The British Government welcomed the initiative of the Federal Republic of Germany and Italy, was in sympathy 'with the basic idea of bringing together the work that member states ... do together inside and outside the framework of the treaties', and saw merit in 'consolidating these proposals in a single text carrying the authority of the heads of Government'. It was natural and right that member states should from time to time look at the way in which the Community worked and it was to Britain's advantage that an agreement should be reached.

Opposition Views

Mr Eric Heffer, the Opposition spokesman on European and Community Affairs, said that the proposals contained 'serious dangers' for the future of British sovereignty since they represented 'a real inroad into the rights and powers of the elected representatives of the people' in member states. They were also the first step towards a supranational Government. On external policy Mr Heffer said that while no-one was against European nations from time to time trying to reach agreement on foreign affairs, this did not require the strengthening of the Community's institutions nor a move towards a federal Europe.

Speaking for the Social Democratic Party, Mr Roy Jenkins (who was elected leader of the party on 2 July), said the proposals were 'relatively modest and sensible' and were an attempt to make the Community's institutions work better without amending the treaties. It was in Britain's

interest that Community decisions should be taken firmly, clearly and expeditiously and that the institutions should work well. In order to reach a solution to Britain's budget problem, decision-making had to be improved and there had to be an evolving Community and not a static one unable to move in any direction.

The Falkland Islands

Following an exchange of notes between the British and Argentine Governments in July, Britain announced that it was satisfied that Argentina had accepted that active hostilities in the South Atlantic were at an end. Details of a proposed committee of inquiry into the events leading to the Argentine invasion of the Falkland Islands in April were given to the House of Commons on 8 July by the Prime Minister, Mrs Margaret Thatcher.

ENDING OF HOSTILITIES

Argentine forces on the Falkland Islands surrendered to British forces on 15 June (see p 180). Under the terms of the surrender all Argentine personnel handed in all their weapons and ammunition, Britain undertaking to treat the Argentine soldiers in accordance with conditions set out in the 1949 Geneva Convention. Some 10,000 prisoners of war were later returned to Argentina on British ships, some 600 being held pending an official cessation of hostilities. On 25 June the Governor, Mr Rex Hunt, returned to the Islands as Civil Commissioner with responsibility for all matters relating to civil administration, the commander of British land forces, Major General Jeremy Moore, being designated as Military Commissioner with responsibility for defence and internal security, excluding the police.

On 15 June Britain sent notes to Argentina through the embassies of Switzerland and Brazil seeking confirmation of the total cessation of hostilities. In response Argentina stated on 18 June that a total cessation of hostilities would be achieved only if certain conditions were fulfilled, including the withdrawal of British forces from the Islands. In a letter to the President of the United Nations Security Council on 23 June, the British Permanent Representative, Sir Anthony Parsons, said that this condition was totally unacceptable to Britain and that its forces were there to defend the Islands and their people against further attacks and to help the Islanders repair the extensive damage caused by the Argentine invasion and occupation. There was no colonial domination or military occupation by Britain, since the Islanders had welcomed their liberation by British forces. Sir Anthony emphasised that the Islands were British territory with a British population and that there could, therefore, be no question of withdrawing British forces.

On 9 July a British message was sent to the Argentine Government via the Swiss Embassy in Buenos Aires noting that there had been no further hostilities in the South Atlantic since 14 June and that the Argentine foreign minister had stated on 5 July that there was a *de facto* ceasefire on the part of Argentina. The message continued: '[The British Government] concludes that it is now accepted by Argentina that active hostilities have ended and on that basis, in accordance with Article 118 of the Third Geneva Convention, proposes to return to Argentina all Argentine prisoners of war still in British hands and invites the Argentine Government to agree appropriate arrangements for their return.'

Two days later the Argentine Government replied proposing that 'in view of the present state of *de facto* cessation of hostilities' arrangements should be put into effect for the reception in the Argentine port of Madryn of the remaining prisoners of war 'still held under harsh conditions by the British Government'. In response on 12 July Britain announced that the remaining 593 prisoners of war would be returned. The Government's statement continued: 'We . . . are satisfied on the basis of the evidence available to us, that the Argentine Government accepts that active hostilities are at an end thereby enabling us to act on release of prisoners of war in accordance with Article 118 of the Third Geneva Convention.' Rejecting the Argentine charge of harsh treatment of the prisoners, the statement described it as offensive and unfounded. 'Argentine prisoners have throughout been treated strictly in accordance with the Geneva Convention and under the supervision of the International Committee of the Red Cross.' If initially their conditions had been difficult, this had largely been due to the destruction and vandalism carried out by Argentine forces during the occupation; subsequently they had for most of the time been held on board the MV *St Edmund* where they were warm, dry and well fed.

The total exclusion zone and Britain's economic sanctions against Argentina are to remain in force for the time being. The European Community lifted its economic sanctions on 21 June, and, following the exchange of notes between Britain and Argentina the United States did so on 12 July.

Repossession of Southern Thule

On 20 June British forces retook control of Southern Thule when a party of military personnel at an illegal Argentine navy research station surrendered. Southern Thule is a group of three small islands and forms part of the South Sandwich Islands which is British sovereign territory. The Argentine research station was set up without British authorisation at the end of 1976 and was maintained despite subsequent British protests.

COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY

The Committee, chaired by Lord Franks,[1] has been set up 'to review the way in which the responsibilities of Government in relation to the Falkland Islands and their dependencies were discharged in the period leading up to the Argentine invasion of

[1]A former British ambassador to the United States (1948 to 1952) and chairman from 1971 to 1972 of a committee set up to review the operation of the Official Secrets Act.

the Falkland Islands on 2 April 1982, taking account of all such factors in previous years as are relevant and to report'. The other members of the inquiry are four former Cabinet ministers (Lord Barber, Lord Watkinson, Lord Lever of Manchester and Mr Merlyn Rees) and a former senior civil servant, Sir Patrick Nairne.

Prime Minister's Speech

Opening a debate in the House of Commons on 8 July (*Hansard*, Vol 27, No 149, cols 469-508), Mrs Thatcher recalled that in April she had announced that an inquiry would be made and said that prior consultations with the Leader of the Opposition and with the leaders of other opposition parties in the House who were Privy Counsellors had 'led to broad agreement on the nature, scope and composition of the review'.

The overriding considerations, the Prime Minister said, were that the review should be independent, command confidence, have access to all relevant papers and persons, and complete its work speedily. She pointed out that since the Committee would be composed of Privy Counsellors,[1] it could be authorised to see relevant departmental documents, Cabinet and Cabinet committee memoranda and minutes, and intelligence assessments and reports. Many of these documents 'could not be made available to a tribunal of inquiry, a Select Committee or a Royal Commission'. Information whose disclosure would be prejudicial to national security or damaging to Britain's international relations would, however, need to be protected. 'The Government will, therefore, suggest to the Committee that it should seek to avoid including any such information in its main report which is to be published, and that, if it needs to draw conclusions or make recommendations which, if published, would entail the disclosure of such information, it should submit them to the Government in a confidential annex which will not be published.' The Government would make no deletions 'save strictly on the grounds of protecting national security or international relations' and the chairman of the Committee would be consulted if any deletions had to be proposed.

Commenting upon the scope of the inquiry, the Prime Minister said that if the events leading up to the invasion were to be fairly viewed they had to be seen against the background of negotiations, actions, intelligence and other assessments over the years. For this purpose the Committee would need to have access to relevant documents of previous administrations as well as those of the present one. Five former Prime Ministers[2] had been consulted and all had agreed that the Committee should have access to the relevant documents of their administration. Mrs Thatcher hoped that the inquiry would be completed within six months.

[1]The Queen has approved Sir Patrick Nairne being sworn as a member of the Privy Council. The other five members were already Privy Counsellors.

[2]The five are Mr Harold Macmillan, Prime Minister from 1957 to 1963, Lord Home (1963–64), Sir Harold Wilson (1964–70 and 1974–76), Mr Edward Heath (1970–74) and Mr James Callaghan (1976–79).

Opposition Views

The Leader of the Opposition, Mr Michael Foot, welcomed the setting up of the inquiry and said that it should be directed predominantly to the events leading to the Argentine invasion, be reasonably swift in reporting to the House and the country, and be likely to secure general support in the House. Noting that the inquiry would be conducted on behalf of the House of Commons, Mr Foot commented that the names of those appointed to the Committee were a guarantee that the matter would be probed in the way that the House was determined that it should be. He thought that the inquiry should not take as long as six months.

The Leader of the Social Democratic Party, Mr Roy Jenkins, said that an inquiry was necessary and that the terms of reference were about right; the central point at issue was why an invasion took place in April 1982 and not why one did not take place on a limitless number of occasions in the past. He hoped that it would work expeditiously and fearlessly.

Gibraltar

Talks between Britain and Spain on the question of Gibraltar, due to have been held on 25 and 26 June, were postponed at Spain's suggestion.

The postponement of the talks, which were to have taken place at foreign minister level at Sintra in Portugal, was announced by the Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary, Mr Francis Pym, and Spain's Minister for Foreign Affairs, Señor José Pedro Perez-Llorca, in a joint statement issued in Luxembourg on 21 June. The statement continued: 'The two ministers are determined to keep alive the process opened by the Lisbon agreement on 10 April [1980, see below] in the spirit of the letters exchanged in London on 8 January 1982. They will remain in touch personally and through the diplomatic channel and a new date for their meeting will be fixed in due course.'

Commenting on the postponement at a news conference in Luxembourg on 21 June, Mr Pym said that the British Government was 'very anxious to continue the Sintra process, which includes of course both discussions with Spain about the differences between our two countries and also, most importantly, the opening of the frontier'. Although he was 'naturally very disappointed', he thought it right to agree to the Spanish suggestion when Señor Perez-Llorca had explained to him the problems that existed in Spain and the possible reaction if the Sintra meeting were to be held at this time. Both the Government and Opposition parties in Gibraltar were anxious to proceed with the Lisbon process and Mr Pym remained confident that the frontier between Spain and Gibraltar would reopen in due course. Both he and Señor Perez-Llorca had acknowledged that it would be 'inconceivable' that the frontier would not be open when Spain joined the European Community in 1984.

Background

In the 1960s the Spanish Government, in support of a campaign to secure the return of Gibraltar to Spain, imposed restrictions on the movement of people between Spain and Gibraltar. In 1969 the border was closed, as were all public telephone links, and the ferry service between Algeciras and Gibraltar was suspended. Although telephone links were restored in 1977, other restrictions have remained in force.

Britain has undertaken never to enter into arrangements whereby the people of Gibraltar would pass under the sovereignty of another state against their freely and democratically expressed wishes. In 1967 a referendum was held in which 12,138 Gibraltarians voted to retain the link with Britain and 44 supported a change to Spanish sovereignty.

The question of Gibraltar has been considered on many occasions by the United Nations General Assembly. In a resolution passed in November 1979 the General Assembly called on Britain and Spain to make possible the initiation of negotiations with the object of reaching a lasting solution to the problem. In the April 1980 Lisbon agreement (see pp 110-11, 1980), Britain and Spain agreed to start negotiations with a view to overcoming all the difficulties between them on Gibraltar at the same time that Spain re-established direct communications with Gibraltar. The two countries also restated their basic positions, the British Government reiterating its 'commitment to honour the freely and democratically expressed wishes of the people of Gibraltar', the Spanish Government reaffirming its position on the 're-establishment of the territorial integrity of Spain' while restating its intention that in the outcome of the negotiations 'the interests of the Gibraltarians should be fully safeguarded'.

The Lisbon agreement originally envisaged that preparations for its implementation would be completed by June 1980, but, though Britain had completed its preparations, this did not take place. Following talks between the British and Spanish Governments in London in January 1982 it was agreed that the negotiations envisaged in the Lisbon agreement should start on 20 April and that, on the same day, the border between Spain and Gibraltar would be re-opened and direct communications re-established. The date was subsequently postponed to 25 June.

Israeli Invasion of Lebanon

Israel's continuing occupation of southern Lebanon and the encirclement and intermittent bombardment of west Beirut by its forces in an apparent attempt to destroy the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO) were the subject of a debate in the House of Commons on 22 June as efforts by the United States special envoy, Mr Philip Habib, to achieve a peaceful outcome continued. The European Council vigorously condemned the Israeli invasion and called for an immediate withdrawal of Israeli and Palestinian forces in and around Beirut. A statement was also made by Belgium on behalf of the European Community at the United Nations Seventh Emergency Special Session on the Question of Palestine, and further resolutions were passed by the United Nations Security Council.

As Israeli forces increased their pressure on Beirut, negotiations continued, involving Mr Habib, the Israeli and Lebanese Governments and the PLO, to agree terms under which the PLO might safely withdraw from the Lebanese capital and leave the country. The talks, which took place against a background of a number of ceasefires, interspersed with renewed fighting, appeared to be deadlocked in mid-July, notably over whether the PLO should be allowed any residual representation in Lebanon and where they should go. The PLO wished to retain a symbolic political presence in Lebanon and was insisting that an international peacekeeping force be deployed before they would leave Beirut. The Israeli position remained that all PLO members without exception should leave Lebanon. The Lebanese Government wanted an international force to assist in 'the orderly and safe evacuation of armed personnel from Beirut' and on 6 July the United States President, Mr Ronald Reagan, expressed his willingness to provide troops for this purpose. Later, on 14 July, the Lebanese Government announced that it was seeking a withdrawal of Israeli, Syrian and Palestinian forces from Lebanon.

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE

Foreign Secretary's Speech

Opening a debate in the House of Commons on 22 June on the Middle East (*Hansard*, Vol 26, No 137, cols 210-46; No 138, cols 247-71), the Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary, Mr Francis Pym, said that the Israeli invasion of Lebanon represented a major setback to prospects for a lasting peace in the Middle East, a region with which Britain enjoyed close and valued links and about whose problems it therefore felt a 'deep and legitimate anxiety'. All British Governments had taken the view that peace and stability in the Middle East were important national and international interests, as well as being essential for the peoples of that troubled region.

Israel's Action

Noting that Israel had justified its action on the grounds of self-defence, Mr Pym said that every state had the legal right to self-defence and that Britain was not and could not be indifferent to the future of Israel, a democratic state to which it was closely linked by many ties of history and culture. 'Israel has the same unchallengeable right to exist in peace and in security, within recognised and guaranteed borders, as every other state.' Nevertheless, Mr Pym continued, any action taken in self-defence had to be in proportion to the threat. He could not accept that the events leading up to the Israeli action justified a full-scale armed invasion with the professed objective of

cleansing a 25-mile deep area of Lebanese territory – an objective, he said, that bore little relation to the course that Israeli forces had followed and which had led them to the outskirts of Beirut.

Another suggestion had been that Israel's aim was to secure the establishment of 'a strengthened Lebanese Government capable of maintaining their authority throughout its territory'. Although Britain wanted to see Lebanon united under a strengthened central Government and at peace, a political settlement in Lebanon, however desirable, could not justify invasion by a neighbouring country. Military action, said Mr Pym, was in any case unlikely to produce a reliable answer to problems requiring solution by political means, and any settlement achieved 'under the shadow of the Israeli army' could not last because it would be seen by Muslims in Lebanon, and by the Arab world generally, as imposed under duress. 'If Israel is really interested in permitting the emergence of a more stable Lebanese political structure, she should withdraw her forces in accordance with Security Council resolution 509 [see p 197] and help to create the conditions that will make the free expression of the wishes of the Lebanese people possible.'

The Palestinian Problem

Mr Pym said that it appeared that the destruction of the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO) was being regarded as an objective in itself and as a means of reducing the Palestinian problem and making it easier to deal with. He continued: 'We recognise Israel's longing for security and understand her unwillingness to deal with the PLO while that organisation refuses to accept her existence and to renounce terrorism as a weapon in its armoury. But the scale of the Israeli invasion has been quite disproportionate to the attack.' The destruction of the PLO's political structure would not enhance Israel's security, would lead to frustration and despair, and could provide 'a return to the extremism that produced the international terrorism of the early 1970s'. The PLO leadership, he added, had tried to lead 'a disparate movement towards a diplomatic solution to their grievances'. If it was routed, the diplomatic path would be discredited in the eyes of many young Palestinians and even, he believed, discarded by some. The Palestinian people would remain 'a factor for instability in the Middle East' until their political aspirations could be met. The autonomy talks (under the Camp David process – see pp 352-5, 1978), although representing one approach to the problem of the political future of the Palestinians, had been dogged by disagreement both on what should be their ultimate objective and on the practical aspects of the powers to be granted to the Palestinians in the occupied territories. The talks could not be a long-term solution to the Palestinian question unless they led to negotiations involving authentic Palestinian representatives.

The Foreign Secretary said that Britain's view, shared by the other members of the European Community, remained that the Palestinian problem could be resolved only by an overall peace settlement which took into account the Palestinians' right to determine their future. Such a settlement 'would provide a much sounder basis for a just and, therefore, lasting peace between Israel and Palestinians than the peace which Israel is attempting to impose by force of arms in Lebanon and by its settlements policy on the West Bank'. He pointed out that the only territory in which an act of Palestinian self-determination could be carried out was the West Bank of the Jordan and Gaza, occupied by Israel in 1967. Since the Palestinians saw their homeland as being on the West Bank, any negotiated settlement had to take this into account, just as it would have to provide 'adequate guarantees for the security of Israel'. The two principles, of Palestinian rights and the Israeli right to security, remained 'as fundamental today as in June 1980 when they were affirmed in the Venice declaration [see pp 202-3, 1980]'.

The Future of Lebanon

Turning to the problem of a secure future for Lebanon, Mr Pym believed that a strengthened peacekeeping force, possibly involving a greater role for the United Nations Interim Force (UNIFIL) or 'a new multinational force outside the United Nations system' was likely to be essential. Reporting on the immediate problem of humanitarian aid, Mr Pym said that Britain had already made available about £55,000 to the Red Cross, mainly for medical supplies, and was giving a further £200,000 to other relief agencies and contributing to aid offered through the European Community. In addition Britain was ready to do its best to meet any specific requests from the Lebanese Government. Noting disquieting reports about delay and hindrance, the Foreign Secretary urged Israel to speed up the flow of humanitarian supplies from international relief agencies.

In conclusion, Mr Pym said that these were difficult days for peace in the Middle East and he did not find it easy to be optimistic about the prospects for a negotiated and comprehensive settlement to the Arab-Israel conflict. But 'it would be a disaster if the Arab states were to conclude from the invasion of Lebanon that such a settlement was now beyond reach. We must make it our business to find the way.'

Opposition Views

The Opposition spokesman on foreign affairs, Mr Denis Healey, said that the war in Lebanon was a great human tragedy and that the scale of the suffering required 'a massive international rescue operation in order to cope with the problem'. Many people, too, were disturbed that prisoners taken by Israeli forces were not being offered the protection that international law should afford to prisoners of war. In addition, he warned that the war was part of a general crisis in the Middle East that could escalate out of control into a superpower confrontation.

Looking beyond the immediate issues to some of the underlying problems, Mr Healey described the Middle East as an area where violence was regularly used to pursue political ends, and where the familiar conflicts of national interest and feeling were enormously aggravated by a growing

spread of religious fundamentalism – Jewish and Muslim. Israel's actions had accelerated this process and done immense damage to its real interests. The only way to slow and reverse the process was to ensure that Israel did not carry out a full-scale assault on Beirut, to persuade it to accept the United Nations Security Council resolution and withdraw its forces from Lebanon, and to re-establish a stronger United Nations peacekeeping force. The destruction of the PLO as a military force, Mr Healey continued, could not kill the desire of the Palestinian people for self-determination, for nothing else would satisfy them. The only land available was on the West Bank of the Jordan and that was where the refugees from Lebanon should now be allowed to return. Nor would anything less suffice to restore good relations between the West and moderate Arab states. Unless the prospect of negotiations for autonomy and self-determination on the West Bank opened rapidly, the PLO was soon likely to revive as a purely terrorist movement.

Mr David Steel, leader of the Liberal Party, said Israel had been looking for a pretext for the invasion and that this had been given by the attack upon the Israeli Ambassador to Britain, Mr Shlomo Argov (see p 196). The retribution had been out of all proportion to the provocation that Israel had suffered for many years from PLO bases in Lebanon. Israeli interests were ill-served by the Israeli Government's action and nothing could have been more calculated to lose Israel friends and influence in the world. Mr Steel warned that Israel would never achieve security based on military force and the annexation of neighbouring territories, but only through a general peace settlement guaranteed by the major powers. The Camp David process had achieved a great deal in bilateral terms but a wider means to advance a Middle East settlement should now be sought. This would include dealing with the PLO, which Palestinians generally had come to believe must act as their voice, whether they were members or not. In return, the PLO had to recognise Israel's right to exist.

On Britain's role, Mr Steel said that the Venice declaration had to be turned into a European initiative. Because of their ties with the Middle East, the countries of Western Europe were in a unique position to exert great influence on both the United States and the Soviet Union which could not be left out of discussions leading to a guaranteed peace settlement.

Government Reply

Replying for the Government, Mr Douglas Hurd, the Minister of State at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, said that suffering on the scale witnessed in Lebanon transcended ordinary arguments on the Middle East expressed in debates over the years. According to information received from the Red Cross and the Lebanese authorities, up to 14,000 people had died in the fighting and up to 20,000 had been wounded. On the treatment of prisoners, the European Community had asked the Israelis on 14 June for a number of assurances (see below), one of which was that the relevant Geneva Conventions should be applied in Israeli-occupied Lebanon.

Commenting on the autonomy process, Mr Hurd said that negotiations between the United States, Israel and Egypt were bogged down because the Israeli interpretation of autonomy was now substantially different from that put forward at the time of the Camp David agreement (see pp 352-5, 1978). Autonomy and self-government by definition required the participation of the Palestinians who lived in the areas concerned, and the denial of Palestinian rights was one – though not the only – cause of Middle East instability. Britain had no illusions about the PLO, which had not abandoned talk of armed struggle and had missed opportunities to show unequivocally and in public that it was willing to accept Israel once Israel had accepted Palestinian rights.

Mr Hurd warned that Britain should not overestimate its influence, but pointed out that this was greater when exercised with the other member states of the European Community which could set out certain principles, edge the parties towards the negotiating table and encourage those in the area willing to talk rather than to fight. Israel was faced with the remarkably difficult choice of basing its security on buffer zones and occupied territories or of respecting the values on which its own state was based and granting to others 'the rights which Israelis quite properly claim for themselves'. If the Israelis accepted that the Palestinians had political rights and were willing to take the giant step of allowing them to exercise those rights on the West Bank, in Gaza and in East Jerusalem, it would be 'entitled to turn to the international community and require arrangements to be made to provide for security, demilitarisation, international guarantees, international forces, and perhaps special status for Jerusalem'.

On Lebanon, Mr Hurd said that there was a need to help the Lebanese rebuild a consensus free of illegitimate foreign pressures. It was only through such consensus that Lebanon could be governed.

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY VIEWS

European Council Statement

Following a meeting of Community heads of Government in Brussels, the European Council (see p 236) on 29 June issued a statement maintaining its vigorous condemnation of the Israeli invasion of Lebanon, expressing great concern about the situation, and stating that the present ceasefire had at all costs to be preserved. This ceasefire, the Council continued, 'should be accompanied . . . by an immediate withdrawal of Israeli forces from their positions around the Lebanese capital as a first step towards their complete withdrawal, and . . . by a simultaneous withdrawal of the Palestinian forces in west Beirut in accordance with procedures to be agreed between the parties'. To facilitate this withdrawal, the separation of forces would be controlled during this short transitional period by Lebanese forces and, with the agreement of the Lebanese

Government, by United Nations observers or forces.

The establishment of a final peace in Lebanon, the statement added, required 'the complete and prompt withdrawal of Israeli forces from that country as well as the departure of all foreign forces except those which may be authorised by a legitimate and broadly representative Government of Lebanon whose authority would be fully re-established over all its national territory'. With regard to relief operations for the Lebanese people, the Council called upon all parties to act in accordance with Security Council resolutions 511 and 512 (see below) and to co-operate with the responsible international agencies as well as with UNIFIL; in addition it expressed willingness to continue humanitarian aid and to assist in the reconstruction of the country.

Finally, referring to the Council's anxiety to see a lasting restoration of peace and security in the region, the Council said that member states 'wish to see negotiations based on the principles of security for all states and justice for all peoples. All the parties concerned should be associated with these and ... should accept one another's existence. Israel will not obtain the security to which it has a right by using force and creating *faits accomplis*, but ... by satisfying the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian people [who] should have the opportunity to exercise their right to self-determination with all that this implies.' At the same time, the Council continued, 'for negotiations to be possible the Palestinian people must be able to commit themselves to them and thus to be represented at them'. In addition, the PLO had to be associated with the negotiations. The Council wished 'to see the Palestinian people in a position to pursue their demands by political means and wish that the achievement of these should take account of the need to recognise and respect the existence and security of all'.

Community Statement at the United Nations

In a statement on behalf of the Community to the United Nations Seventh Emergency Special Session on the Question of Palestine on 26 June, the Belgian delegate, Miss Dever, reiterated the Community's vigorous condemnation of the Israeli action and, referring to its earlier declaration of 9 June (see p 197), said that if Israel persisted in its refusal to implement resolutions 508, 509 and 512 the European Community would examine what further action it could take. Already the signing of a financial protocol with Israel had been postponed *sine die*. The Community had also invited the Israeli Government on 14 June to give certain assurances. These were that it would:

1 admit international humanitarian aid organisations to the territory that it had occupied and facilitate their work,

2 admit press representatives,

3 comply with the Geneva Conventions, particularly with regard to prisoners,

4 recognise the sovereignty of the Lebanese state and the international border between Lebanon and Israel,

5 not seek to annex or occupy any part of Lebanon,

6 not interfere in Lebanon's domestic affairs and

7 co-operate fully with the United Nations Secretary-General.

Israel was also asked to give assurances that it had no hostile intentions towards the Palestinian people nor any intention to attack neighbouring countries, including Syria, and that it would observe the ceasefire that had been established so long as the other belligerents also did so. No satisfactory answer had, however, been given by the Israeli Government.[1]

UNITED NATIONS RESOLUTIONS

On 18 June the United Nations Security Council passed resolution 511 extending the mandate of the United Nations Interim Force (UNIFIL) for a period of two months until 19 August, authorising it to carry out certain additional tasks, and calling upon all concerned to extend full co-operation to the Force in the discharge of its tasks.

Explaining Britain's support for the resolution, Sir Anthony Parsons, the British Permanent Representative, said that the British Government was horrified by 'the terrible suffering and damage which [had] been inflicted upon Lebanon and its people'. Large numbers of innocent men, women and children had been killed or wounded, hundreds of thousands had been made homeless, and whole coastal cities had been devastated. Britain was seriously concerned about the risks of the conflagration spreading and hostilities had escalated despite appeals for restraint by the United Nations Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council. Although resolution 509, calling for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli forces, had been accepted by the PLO and the Lebanese Government, Israel had not done so and the invading Israeli forces had subsequently advanced to the outskirts of Beirut leaving 'a wave of destruction' behind them. Sir Anthony continued: 'The facts are plain. Israel has invaded Lebanon in flagrant violation of international law and Paragraph 4 of Article 2 of the Charter, as well as in complete disregard of the demands of the Security Council. My Government regards the invasion and occupation as a violation of Lebanon's sovereignty and we cannot accept that the Israeli action amounted to self-defence.'

Reaffirming Britain's strong support for the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and national unity of Lebanon, Sir Anthony said there could be no real peace or stability in the region unless the aspirations of the Palestinian people

[1]With regard to assurance (3), the Israeli Government has since stated that captured Palestinian prisoners are being treated not as prisoners of war (under the Third Geneva Convention) but as civilian detainees under the Fourth Geneva Convention. In a parliamentary reply on 5 July (*Hansard*, Vol 27, No 146, written answers, col 36), Mr Douglas Hurd, Minister of State at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, said that Israel had assured the British Government that 'Palestinian prisoners are being treated properly and humanely by the Israeli armed forces'.

were also taken into account. 'We do not believe that it is either wise or just for Israel to seek to deny people the right which it claims for itself. Any lasting and peaceful solution will have to confirm both Israel's right to peace and security and the Palestinian people's right to self-determination.'

Turning to the immediate question of the future of UNIFIL, Sir Anthony paid tribute to the 'selfless efforts' which the Force had made and was continuing to make on behalf of the international community. The British Government did not accept the 'misguided criticisms' that had been made about the Force's inability to prevent the Israeli advance, since it had neither the mandate nor the military capacity to counter an invasion. It was still too early to know whether there would be a role for UNIFIL in the 'new and radically altered circumstances in Lebanon'. But Britain believed that it was 'right to reserve the option for such a role, an option which might well be lost if the Force were precipitately disbanded'. The Force might also be able to play a helpful and humanitarian role in so far as circumstances permitted, and Britain called upon the Government of Israel to show 'the full respect for UNIFIL which it has so far failed to do'.

In conclusion, Sir Anthony said it was essential that the fighting should now come to an end and that Israel should immediately withdraw all her forces from Lebanon to the internationally recognised boundary. 'The rule of international law must be upheld or we shall all suffer the grim consequences of the failure to do so.'

On 19 June the Security Council passed resolution 512 calling upon the parties to the conflict to respect the rights of the civilian populations, to refrain from all acts of violence against them and to take all appropriate measures to alleviate the suffering caused by the conflict, in particular, by facilitating the dispatch and distribution of aid provided by United Nations agencies and by non-governmental organisations, in particular, the International Committee of the Red Cross. The resolution appealed to member states to continue to provide the most extensive aid possible and called upon all parties to the conflict not to hamper the United Nations and its agencies in the exercise of their humanitarian responsibilities towards civilian populations.

Shorter Notes

FIRST COMMONWEALTH EMPLOYMENT AND LABOUR MINISTERS' MEETING

The first Commonwealth Meeting of Employment and Labour Ministers took place in Geneva on 1 June. Twenty-seven countries attended, Britain being represented by the Minister of State at the Department of Employment, Mr Michael Alison.

In response to a request by Commonwealth heads of Government in October 1981 (see pp 295-300, 1981), the meeting was held at the time of the 68th International Labour Conference and observers from the International Labour Organisation were also present.

Discussing the effects of the world recession on employment, ministers expressed their deep concern about the economic and social implications of the rising levels of unemployment and under-employment in their countries, in particular for young people and women. They reviewed specific measures being taken by member governments, including programmes for technical and vocational education and training, and special schemes for employment creation, notably in the rural sector. Views were exchanged on a number of related matters including the international migration of labour, the impact on employment of microelectronics technology, and industrial relations and worker participation in management. Noting the already significant extent of Commonwealth co-operation in education and training, ministers discussed the need for increased bilateral and multilateral assistance, especially in the fields of technical and vocational training, and considered the possibility of establishing a Commonwealth working party to draw up guidelines for the management of technological change. A submission was received from the Commonwealth Trade Union Council on the experience of organised labour with special attention to workers' education and training.

Source: Commonwealth Secretariat news release No 82/17, 7.6.82.

AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FUND

Britain is to give some £24·2 million to the African Development Fund for commitments by it from 1982 to 1984. This is part of a total third replenishment of $1,059 million approved by the boards of governors of the African Development Bank and Fund on 8 May 1982. Britain's intended contribution was approved by the House of Commons following a short debate on 7 July (*Hansard*, Vol 27, No 148, cols 378–87).

Giving details of the Fund's assets, the Minister for Overseas Development, Mr Neil Marten, said that the initial funding, a special increase and the first two replenishments had provided resources of some $1,251 million for commitment between 1973 and 1981. Negotiations for the third replenishment had started in January 1981 and were successfully completed in February 1982. An important new feature was the inclusion in the replenishment of special provision for 5 per cent of the whole to be available for technical assistance on extremely concessional terms. Britain and the other donors were agreed with the Fund management that agriculture in all its forms should be the top priority, as it was with other bodies such as the World Bank.

Expressing his conviction that the African Development Fund would continue to help the poorest countries of the region to solve their serious problems by promoting economic and

social progress, the Minister concluded: 'Britain must play its full part in this important work.'

The African Development Fund is an institution based on equal partnership between non-regional donor countries and the African Development Bank. Established in 1973, the Fund lends money on concessional terms to regional members of the Bank for their economic and social advancement. Britain has been a member of the Fund since its inception and has already committed £31 million, of which £7·8 million has been spent. In May 1981 Britain announced its intention to become a non-regional member of the African Development Bank when the agreement establishing the Bank was amended by the existing regional members, opening its capital stock to non-regional states (see p 169, 1981). The amended agreement became effective on 7 May 1982 and the necessary parliamentary approval for Britain's membership will be sought in the autumn of 1982.

MAURITIUS: ILOIS AGREEMENT

On 7 July, the British and Mauritian Governments formally signed an agreement providing further assistance to the Ilois community resettled in Mauritius from the Chagos Archipelago, which is part of the British Indian Ocean Territory. Under the agreement, which was initialled in March following negotiations in which representatives of the Ilois community participated, Britain is to make an *ex gratia* payment of £4 million in a full and final settlement of all Ilois claims, the sum to be administered for the benefit of the Ilois community by a trust set up by the Mauritian Government, while the latter will provide the Ilois land worth £1 million. The agreement in no way affects Britain's sovereignty over the Chagos Archipelago.

After agreements with the Mauritian and Seychelles Governments in 1965 Britain set up the British Indian Ocean Territory comprising the islands of the Chagos Archipelago, including the largest, Diego Garcia, from Mauritius, and three island groups from the Seychelles. Before that, the Chagos Islands had been in the private ownership of a company which had been exploiting the copra plantations since the eighteenth century. The British Government purchased the islands in 1967. Since the islands were privately owned, their small 'Ilois' population of mixed African, European, Chinese and Indian origins had no legal rights to remain, owned no property and their status was one of employees with licence to reside on the islands at the discretion of the owners, on whom they depended entirely for their livelihood.

In 1966 Britain and the United States decided to use the Chagos Islands for defence purposes[1] and subsequently to run down the copra plantations, resettling plantation workers and their community elsewhere. Since most of the community had close ties with Mauritius, the majority (1,200 people) chose to settle there, the last arriving in 1973. Though Britain had agreed to a Mauritian Government resettlement programme for which it provided, with interest, an eventual £936,000 in return for a full and final settlement of all Ilois claims for further compensation, agreement between the Mauritian Government and the Ilois proved difficult. As negotiations continued, Britain made an *ex gratia* offer in 1979 amounting to a further £1·25 million and in July 1981, conditional upon agreement on a full and final settlement, offered a further £300,000 in aid funds to assist the integration of the Ilois community into Mauritian society. These talks, however, ended without agreement.

[1]When establishing the British Indian Ocean Territory, Britain agreed that the Chagos Archipelago would be ceded to Mauritius when it was no longer needed for defence purposes.

ECONOMIC AND SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

Nationalised Industries and Export Achievement

Britain's nationalised industries have been winning substantial business overseas. It is estimated that the total value of the overseas business won by those industries which are members of the Nationalised Industries Overseas Group was over £2,500 million in 1981-82, with consultancy work accounting for some £200 million. The Group's members handled some 1,200 different contracts in well over 100 countries.

A special report outlining the activities of the Group (known overseas as British Nationalised Industries Overseas Services) and of its members is outlined in the 18 June issue of *British business*.[1] The Group was formed in 1976 to promote closer collaboration on exports between the nationalised industries, and between them and their customers, suppliers of plant and equipment, private sector consultancy services, and similar enterprises in other countries (especially within the European Community). This article contains a selection of some of the members' overseas-related activities.

British Airports International

British Airports International is a consultancy organisation, formed jointly by the British Airports Authority and International Aeradio, and its capability includes all aspects of the planning, construction, operation and maintenance of airports and air navigation facilities. Its current projects include an airport feasibility study at Tunis, airport studies in Malaysia and Cameroon, a maintenance complex study at Baghdad, and a comprehensive training programme for the State Organisation of Iraqi Civil Aviation and State Organisation of Roads and Bridges in Iraq.

British Coal International

British Coal International, led by the National Coal Board and including a number of other companies and trade associations, promotes British mining expertise overseas and co-ordinates the overseas activities of its members. Overseas sales of members have increased fourfold in the last four years, to reach £506 million in 1981 comprising coal, coke and derived by-products valued at £352 million, mining equipment £133 million, and consultancy and other services £21 million. Mining equipment is sold to over 100 countries and products and services to 60 countries. Among the areas where British coal mining technology is being utilised significantly are North America, Africa and Australia. In 1981, 80 per cent of new longwall mining installations in the United States were British-made.

British Electricity International

Through British Electricity International (a subsidiary of the Electricity Council responsible for the overseas consultancy activities of Britain's electricity supply industry), the electricity industry offers overseas organisations a wide range of consultancy services covering all aspects of electricity generation, transmission and distribution. It is currently deploying some 300 electricity supply industry personnel in over 30 countries.

British Gas Corporation

Over the last 12 years the British Gas Corporation has helped gas industries in over 20 countries through its international consultancy service in the areas of gas production and treatment, transmission, distribution and utilisation. Recently it has helped to develop a gas distribution system in Chile, sold a gas-making plant to Brazil, and is helping Egypt to develop its natural gas industry. The United States and Japan are long-established customers of the consultancy service and recently the service has been appointed in an advisory capacity to the Hong Kong Government. The Corporation's processes for making gas from oil have been sold under licence throughout the world and its slagging gasifier for making gas from coal has aroused international interest.

British Postal Consultancy Service

Since 1965 consultants of the British Postal Consultancy Service (a division of the Post Office) have undertaken a wide variety of projects in over 30 countries including Hong Kong (where it advised on the new international mail centre), Bahrain, Botswana, Colombia, the Irish Republic, Jamaica, Malaysia, Qatar, Tanzania and Thailand. Advice has been provided on subjects including advanced postal mechanisation, staff training, introducing Giro and Datapost services, financial and organisational studies, and postal building feasibility studies.

[1]Available from HMSO, £1·10. ISBN 0 11 726716 3.

British Rail

British Rail's consultancy subsidiary, Transmark, has carried out over 300 projects in 70 countries and in 1981 (when its turnover was more than £5 million) it worked on 91 projects in 27 countries. The Australian XPT train, based on British Rail's High Speed Train design and built in Australia under a licence arranged by Transmark, made its debut in 1981. Transmark is project manager for the modernisation and electrification in Hong Kong of the Kowloon-Canton Railway and is implementing a locomotive and rolling stock maintenance plan for Egyptian National Railways. In 1981 British Rail Engineering Ltd exported 24 coaches and 120 wagons to Tanzania and 128 wagons to Bangladesh. Orders won so far in 1982 include a contract to supply main-line passenger coaches worth a total of £20 million to the Irish Republic and an export order worth £24 million for the supply of passenger coaches to Kenya.

British Shipbuilders

The merchant shipbuilding division of British Shipbuilders currently has overseas orders from Hong Kong, Panama, Greece and Canada. British Shipbuilders has some of the most modern and efficient shipyards in the world. A new range of ships has been added to the existing range including a B42/45 bulk carrier and a new SD22 multi-purpose general cargo vessel.

British Steel Corporation

British Steel Corporation (Overseas Services), a wholly owned subsidiary of the Corporation, provides technical, managerial and operational services covering most iron and steelmaking process and finishing operations, together with the assessment of raw materials. It has experience of operating in some 40 countries and is currently involved in substantial work in Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, India, South Africa, Venezuela and Libya.

British Telecom

Telconsult, the consultancy arm of British Telecom, has helped a number of developing countries to modernise their telecommunications systems and its experience includes engineering, installation and maintenance. It can plan communications projects from small rural requirements to major international connections.

Work by Other Members

The Civil Aviation Authority's training facilities are open to students from overseas, of whom 1,060 from 48 countries were trained during 1981. Access to such training has proved of great value to countries developing their civil aviation facilities. Training is possibly the most significant area of consultancy within the National Bus Company, the other areas being management advice to transport bodies, and planning and control systems. In the last two years it has provided consultants for projects in Trinidad and Tobago, Cyprus, India, Portugal, Sri Lanka and Venezuela. London Transport International (a subsidiary of London Transport) provides advice, project management and technical assistance in all areas of public transport. Its most recent overseas success has been winning a contract to modernise New York's subway (underground railway) system under which it will deal with the redevelopment of two major train overhaul shops and assist in the modernisation of 13 rail car depots. Placon Ltd (the consultancy subsidiary of the Port of London Authority) has undertaken consultancy work in ports and harbours in a number of countries including Nigeria, Egypt, Sudan, Oman, Iran, Pakistan, Mexico, Australia, Denmark and Greece. The overseas business of the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority mainly involves the supply of fuel elements for materials-testing nuclear reactors, post-irradiation examination of fuel and materials, and consultancy work. Other members whose work is outlined in the report are the British Transport Docks Board, the National Water Council and Remploy (a non-profit-making company providing sheltered employment for the severely disabled).

Youth Training Scheme

The Government has approved a comprehensive Youth Training Scheme to begin in September 1983. The scheme will remove the threat of unemployment from all 16-year-old school leavers during their first year in the labour market, and will bring together some 460,000 employed and unemployed young people under a single, integrated programme to help them to acquire the skills they need to obtain and keep jobs.

The Secretary of State for Employment, Mr Norman Tebbit, announced in the House of Commons on 21 June (*Hansard*, Vol 26, No 136, cols 22-30) that the Government accepted the proposals in the comprehensive training scheme put forward by the Manpower Services Commission (MSC).[1] The scheme, which has the support of the Confederation of British Industry and the Trades Union Congress, is an extension of proposals put forward by the Government in December 1981 in the White Paper *A New Training Initiative* (see pp 21-4). Mr Tebbit described it as being 'fully in line with the Government's ultimate objective for training young people. It meets the Government's requirements on the guarantee to all unemployed 16-year-olds, on the September 1983 date of introduction, on the content and length of the training programme, on involvement of the local community in delivery and on the need to keep within the resources made available in last December's White Paper. However, the MSC scheme extends beyond last December's proposals by covering also many young people in employment, including apprentices, and it proposes a higher level of training allowance.'

[1] *Youth Task Group Report*. Available free from the Manpower Services Commission, Selkirk House, 166 High Holborn, London WC1V 6PF.

Employers will share in the training cost, and this will permit the training allowance to be increased to £1,300 a year without additional cost to the taxpayer or any loss of training standards. Although the Government believes that the resources will be sufficient to cover all unemployed 17-year-old school leavers when the scheme begins, it is not yet possible to give a guarantee to this group, or to say when the scheme might be extended to cover all other unemployed 17-year-olds. In deciding the resources required, the Government has assumed substantial assistance from the European Social Fund.

The Government accepts the need for a large initial funding of the youth scheme while youth unemployment is high, but before 1985 it aims to review the future distribution of the training costs between employers and the Government. The MSC intends to undertake, in co-operation with the Government, a study of funding of industrial training generally, which would help to decide the level of public funding in the longer term.

The Government still believes that 16-year-old unemployed school leavers should not be entitled to supplementary benefit in their own right. However, it has noted 'the firmly held and clearly expressed views of those on whom the operation of the scheme depends that its launch could be seriously impaired by the withdrawal of supplementary benefit from 16-year-olds'. The Government has therefore decided that withdrawal of supplementary benefit will not take place in September 1983 and that there will be a further review after a year's operation of the scheme. Like adults, however, those 16-year-olds who unreasonably refuse a suitable training place will have their benefit reduced for six weeks.

The scheme is, Mr Tebbit said, 'an immense step forward towards setting standards and systems of training for our young people as good as those anywhere overseas. Its success now depends above all on the efforts made by employers and other sponsors, supported by unions, all of whom have fashioned its shape, to provide enough good quality training places.'

THE MSC PROPOSALS

The youth task group report begins by emphasising that it is not concerned with temporary measures to help youth unemployment, but rather with 'providing a permanent bridge between school and work'. The report is about 'greatly increasing opportunities, widening options and realising the potential of our young people'. The aim is 'to provide for what the economy needs, and what employers want – a better equipped, better qualified, better educated and better motivated workforce'.

The report recalls the three inter-related objectives for training in the 1980s, as expressed in the *New Training Initiative* (see pp 178-9, 1981);

1 To develop skill training, including apprenticeship, in such a way as to enable young people entering at different ages and with different educational attainments to acquire agreed standards of skill appropriate to the jobs available and to provide them with a basis for progression through further learning.

2 To move towards a position where all young people under the age of 18 have the opportunity either of continuing in full-time education or of entering a period of planned work experience combined with work-related training and education.

3 To open up widespread opportunities for adults, whether employed, unemployed or returning to work, to acquire, increase or update their skills and knowledge during the course of their working lives.

The recommendations of the group seek to give effect to the second of these objectives, while contributing substantially to the first and laying a foundation for the third.

The report states the premise that prosperity and growth require invention, innovation, investment and exploitation of new technologies. They require the exploitation of new and growing markets to replace those that are declining and require standards of production and service as competitive, effective and reliable as those of Britain's competitors. This can only be achieved with a well-qualified, well-trained and mobile workforce, which requires proper vocational preparation for young people entering work. It is not possible to rely on individual firms to provide this on the necessary scale; a comprehensive programme of vocational preparation for employed and unemployed young people calls for funding which recognises the public and private benefits of training and the need for substantial state intervention.

In the light of the present employment market, a number of longer-term needs for training young people are identified:

1 Because the future employment destination of most young people is uncertain, training for more than one specific job or company is needed.

2 The decline of unskilled work means that the basis for higher levels of competence must be laid.

3 The changing context of work, implying the involvement of more people in processes rather than the repeated performance of a single task, requires training to meet the needs of a variety of industries, firms and occupations.

4 The competitiveness of the labour market calls for basic knowledge of the world of work, job search and related skills.

5 The likelihood that many young people will experience periods of unemployment means that they will need 'personal and life skills' to help them to survive and benefit from change.

6 Because young people have their own expectations and aspirations, opportunities must be designed for their benefit as well as those of the economy.

For employers the costs of training young people are high, and they therefore have much to gain from a scheme which increases the number

of trained young people without costing more than the present arrangements. Schemes at present in operation include: the Unified Vocational Preparation Programme, for employed young people; the Youth Opportunities Programme, a training and work experience programme for unemployed young people; and the Training for Skills Programme, which in part consists of a training programme for employed young people at craft and technician level. However, the report points out, there is no longer anything unique or distinctive about those joining any particular programme, while those who provide the programmes are increasingly involved in all programmes and see barriers between them as often artificial and detrimental to the needs of young people or the economy. The existing schemes have taught the value of: simplicity, local (rather than centralised) organisation, flexibility in training courses, a broad-based and integrated programme of education, training and work experience, careful consideration of financial arrangements, clear targets of achievement (the more ambitious the target the greater and more rapid the response), quality rather than quantity, and the key role of employers.

Requirements for a Comprehensive Scheme

The Government in the White Paper requires a guarantee that all minimum age school leavers[1] in 1983 who are unemployed during their first year after leaving school should have an early offer of training, which should be of high quality and in most cases last a year, with at least three months off-the-job training or further education. Other young people under 18 who leave school or further education and become unemployed within 12 months of leaving should be eligible for similar training but not guaranteed a place. The nature and level of remuneration of young people in training should be appropriate and affordable within the resources, which cannot be exceeded.

The new scheme must induce sponsors of all kinds to make available very large-scale provision and must therefore avoid detailed prescription of what should be included. It must provide sufficient incentives to encourage provision by employers of all kinds and sizes, together with more and better training for the young people they may now engage and for those currently or prospectively unemployed. The scheme must involve and secure commitment from employers, local authorities, trade unions, the education service, the careers service, and voluntary and youth organisations, both at national and local levels. It has to provide for young people taking part to be treated as trainees and for this to be reflected in the nature and level of what they are paid, but only if provision of training to standards is guaranteed in return; to make sure of this, there must be an enforceable contract with the provider of training. Agreements must be made which stipulate what both the trainer and trainee may expect of each other. The quality of training provided must be assured, and a recognised certification of achievement in the scheme must be provided. There must be a guarantee that no young person leaving school at the minimum age shall be left unemployed and without the offer of an opportunity within the scheme. The funding of the scheme must provide for the Government, the sponsor and the young person all, in different ways, to contribute, and the scheme has to be a voluntary one, in which people participate because it offers what they seek and value.

[1]That is, a young person leaving education in the school year in which he or she attains the minimum age for leaving school, normally 16.

How the Scheme Will Work

The scheme, the report says, must use all types of sponsor, individually or in groups – employers, local authorities, local education authorities, voluntary organisations, and industrial training boards. The aim, however, should be for private and public sector employers to provide the majority of opportunities. Sponsors will be encouraged to ensure the integration of training, work experience and related further education, and where possible a specified organisation should take responsibility for the complete programme for each individual trainee. The report proposes managing agencies to design programmes which involve a number of agencies.

Initially opportunities will be provided for all 16-year-olds who have left full-time education for work and for those leaving full-time education aged 17 who become unemployed during the first year of leaving. The young people will be trainees, with a traineeship agreement stating the length and general content of the programme, remuneration, additional opportunities open during the course of training and the access to support or advice. The sponsor's obligations should be recognised in the Manpower Services Commission's agreement with the sponsor and legally enforceable. The placing agencies, primarily the careers service, will be responsible for submitting to agencies and sponsors young people for places in the scheme and for advising and guiding young people on the choices available.

The remuneration which trainees receive will be regarded as an allowance, although this will not apply to young people participating in the scheme as employees. There will be a standard training allowance of about £1,300, subject to review when the scheme begins in 1983, and travel expenses in excess of £4 a week will be reimbursed. Funding will be carried out either in the form of a block grant to the sponsor for each trainee or through the MSC's arrangement of training workshops and community projects, as carried out at present under the Youth Opportunities Programme.

The performance of the new scheme, the report says, will depend on the following elements:

1 The sponsor, whose standards should be examined and approved.

2 The managing agency, usually a sponsor, which will co-ordinate and supervise sponsors where each is able to offer only part of a programme.

3 Local boards (some 50–60 throughout the country) to assess the quality and nature of opportunities required, to oversee managing agen-

cies and ensure that individual schemes meet nationally determined criteria, to mobilise local support and to monitor the progress of schemes.

4 A national supervisory board, to ensure that the scheme is meeting the needs of all the young people concerned; this will represent employers, trade unions, local authorities, local education authorities, voluntary and youth organisations and the careers service.

5 Quality control, to be maintained on a national level by an advisory group providing technical and professional advice to the national supervisory board, on a local level by advice from the MSC (strengthened by people with practical experience) to advise local boards, and at the point of contact by a scheme of in-service training of supervisors, line managers and instructors, and other education and youth tutors.

Aid for the Regions and Tourism

The Government has announced the final results of its review of the areas of Great Britain qualifying for official regional aid, and has given details of arrangements for aid to English regional development organisations and to tourism projects in Great Britain.

Assisted Areas Review

In 1979 the Government initiated a review of the assisted areas[1] of Great Britain in order to concentrate regional aid where it was most needed (see pp 265-9, 1979). Some changes were made immediately and others in 1980. A final round of changes is to take effect from 1 August 1982, but the Government gave an undertaking that there would be a special review of cases in which former Special Development Areas or Development Areas were due to lose their assisted area status altogether. As there has been a substantial increase in unemployment since 1979, the Government has additionally looked carefully at a number of other areas whose circumstances seem to have deteriorated relatively to the country as a whole.

Details of the final review were given in a statement in the House of Commons on 28 June by the Secretary of State for Industry, Mr Patrick Jenkin (*Hansard*, Vol 26, No 141, cols 610-20). The changes to the initial plan are as follows:

Scotland: the Lerwick, Kirkwall, Forres and Nairn travel-to-work areas retain the Intermediate Area status which they acquired in 1980 but were due to lose from 1 August 1982;

North-east England: the Teesside travel-to-work area, currently a Development Area, will become a Special Development Area from 1 August 1982;

North-west England: of the Rochdale, Rossendale, Bolton, Leigh and Northwich travel-to-work areas, all due to lose assisted area status on 1 August 1982, the first two will become Development Areas, and the other three will retain their Intermediate Area status;

Wales: the Llanelli and Pontypool travel-to-work areas, which are currently part Development Area and part Intermediate Area, will become Development Areas throughout.

Apart from these cases, the decisions announced in July 1979 will be implemented unchanged. The coverage of the assisted areas from 1 August 1982 will be around 27 per cent of the working population in the areas with the most persistent problems of high unemployment.

English Regions

The Government has decided to continue for a further three-year period from 1 April 1983 the grants that are made to four regional development organisations in England, and to increase the grants in order to bring arrangements in England more into line with those in Scotland and Wales. The four organisations are the North East Development Council, the North West Industrial Development Association, the Yorkshire and Humberside Development Association and the Devon and Cornwall Development Bureau. They are voluntary bodies sponsored by trade associations, individual firms and local authorities.

Announcing the decision on 24 June (*Hansard*, Vol 26, No 139, written answers, cols 146-7), the Minister of State for Industry, Mr Norman Lamont, said that the governmental aid would support the work of these bodies in attracting inward investment to their regions. The Government is prepared to increase the level of grant not just to take account of inflation, but to allow some real increase in the effort made by the development organisations overseas. The grants will be increased by at least 50 per cent if the organisations can agree with the Department of Industry on realistic costed programmes of overseas promotion for each year. The grants may be increased still further if the organisations are also able to co-ordinate fully the overseas promotion activities of the local authorities and new town development corporations in their regions. The development organisations are receiving £610,000 in 1982-83.

Tourism

Hitherto financial aid from the Government to the English, Scottish and Wales Tourist Boards to help to develop tourism projects has been confined to the assisted areas (see above). Following the review of the assisted areas, however, the Minister of State for Trade, Mr Ian Sproat, announced on 28 June (*Hansard*, Vol 26, No 141, written answers, col 211) that support for tourism would no longer be tied to the assisted areas but based on considerations more directly related to the needs of tourism. Accordingly, suitable tourism projects throughout Great Britain will become eligible for consideration for selective aid. (Separate arrangements are made for Northern Ireland.)

[1]There are three categories of assisted area, Special Development Area, Development Area and Intermediate Area, the need for assistance being considered most urgent in the first and least in the last. The assisted areas are mainly in Scotland, Wales, and the north-west, north-east, Humberside and south-west regions of England.

Mr Sproat said that the Government placed great importance on the development of the tourism industry, which made a valuable contribution to the national economy and the balance of payments.

Shorter Notes

NATIONAL ENTERPRISE BOARD

Since the British Technology Group (BTG) came into being (combining the National Enterprise Board and the National Research Development Corporation – see p 238, 1981), it has undergone a major transformation, the chairman, Sir Frederick Wood notes in an introduction to the annual report of the National Enterprise Board (NEB) for 1981.[1] 'I am pleased with the direction in which the organisation is now pointing, even though a great deal of time has had to be spent in the last 12 months on a small number of "problem" NEB investments,' he said.

It is hoped that by combining the technical expertise of the National Research Development Corporation with the commercial flair of the NEB, the BTG will be able, in conjunction with private sector finance, to improve on Britain's record in exploiting the inventive genius of its people. The reorganisation of the two bodies has involved the establishment of new functional groups, the improvement of links with academic institutions and the creation of new regional offices in England. The priorities for the BTG, says Sir Frederick, are to identify technology which has commercial value and can strengthen Britain's industrial base, and to act as a pathfinder for private sector financial institutions in the identification of investment opportunities.

The NEB's results for 1981 reflect both the recession in manufacturing industry and the requirement under its guidelines (see p 300, 1980) to dispose of its profitable investments as soon as possible. The NEB made an operating loss of £56·24 million in 1981 (compared with a loss of £13·65 million in the previous year). This was primarily due to the disposals of NEXOS, an office equipment company, and of INSAC, a computer systems marketing company based in the United States, and to the provision of start-up costs for a joint venture company (linking the Data Recording Instrument Company with a United States company) to be known as United Peripherals. The NEB contributed £18 million to the Exchequer in 1981 (not included in the profit and loss account) from sales of investments.

The setting-up of the Grosvenor Development Corporation (see p 183, 1981) had enabled the NEB to introduce private sector capital into eight of its former investments, Sir Frederick said. New investments in 1981 included a partnership with Ranks Hovis McDougall to develop the company's new protein food, mycoprotein, the formation of Oakwood Loan Finance (see p 115, 1981) and moves to set up enterprise funds in the English regions.

At the end of 1981 the NEB had interests in 46 companies representing assets employed of £149 million. The turnover of the NEB and its subsidiaries was £129 million, including exports of £63 million.

[1] *National Enterprise Board Annual Report and Accounts 1981. (British Technology Group.)* Available from the BTG Information Department at 12-18 Grosvenor Gardens, London SW1W 0DW, up to 31 October 1982; thereafter at 101 Newington Causeway, London SE1 6BU. £2·75.

CHANNEL TUNNEL

A fixed link across the English Channel could be economically advantageous, and the best form of permanent link would be bored twin rail tunnels able to handle both conventional rail traffic and wagons carrying private cars and commercial vehicles, according to the report of a British-French study group, published on 16 June. The group was set up following the summit meeting between the Prime Minister, Mrs Margaret Thatcher, and President Mitterrand in September 1981, to study the technical and economic considerations entering into the possible construction of a fixed Channel link. (About eight proposals for a fixed link, varying from bridges to bored tunnels, are being considered by the Government.) The report suggests that the options open to ministers are to rely solely on the development of shipping and air services, to defer a decision until further studies have been carried out into forms of fixed link other than bored tunnels, or to decide in principle that a fixed link in the form of a bored tunnel or tunnels is desirable. It concludes that, although existing services could be developed to cope with foreseeable growth in cross-Channel traffic, a fixed link would probably offer cost savings and other economic advantages on a scale sufficient to outweigh the capital investment involved. It believes that the balance of advantage lies with bored twin rail tunnels with a vehicle shuttle and built, if necessary, in phases. This solution would appear to be in the broad interests of both countries as it would offer a secure means of transport, would be energy saving in operation, and would not adversely affect employment. The technical feasibility of rail tunnels has been confirmed and the group considers that development of the projects has reached the stage where, if detailed studies were started immediately and carried out speedily, construction of a bored tunnel could begin during 1984 and be completed in 1991.

The question of organisational, legal and financial arrangements for the construction of any fixed link lay outside the group's terms of reference and the British and French Governments have agreed that, before a decision is reached, these aspects should be examined. This further study should be completed by autumn 1982.

Sources: *Hansard*, Vol 25, No 133, cols 940-1. *Fixed Channel Link Report of UK/French Study Group.* Cmnd 8561. Department of Transport. HMSO, £6·40. ISBN 0 10 185610 5.

RADIO-TELEPHONE SERVICES

The Government is anxious to facilitate an early and substantial expansion of radio-telephone services and has set up an independent review of the radio spectrum and initiated preparatory arrangements for licensing the provision of radio-telephone services in the event that the necessary frequencies are made available. In a statement in the House of Commons on 25 June, the Secretary of State for Industry, Mr Patrick Jenkin, said that the Home Secretary, Mr William Whitelaw, had already announced on 15 June an independent review of the radio spectrum and his provisional decision that 30 megahertz (MHz) of spectrum in the band 854-960 MHz should be allocated to radio-telephone services. Both secretaries of state were 'convinced that manufacturing industry, transport, consumers and the economy generally can derive significant benefits from early and substantial expansion of radio-telephone services, provided this can be arranged without prejudice to the interests of other users of mobile radio'. He therefore intended to press ahead with preparatory licensing arrangements, which were designed to permit the frequencies to be taken into service as quickly as possible once a final decision about their allocation had been made. They took account of recommendations to the Department of Industry of a working group representing public and private bodies with an interest in radio-phones.

In the Government's view, Mr Jenkin said, 'radio-telephone services will develop more rapidly and user interests will be best safeguarded in a competitive environment .... The Government agrees with the working group's conclusion that, subject to satisfactory commercial and technical arrangements between them, two competing networks may well provide the best balance between the benefits of competition and those of maximising spectrum efficiency.' He was inviting private sector companies (a number of which had put forward outline proposals to the Department of Industry) and British Telecom to develop their proposals on the basis that there would be two competing radio-telephone networks in Britain, both to be licensed on equal terms and conditions by his Department and each to be allocated half the available new spectrum. In order that at least half the frequencies could be brought into use quickly, he intended that a licence for half the frequencies should be issued to a subsidiary company of British Telecom in which the private sector would own at least half the shares; the company would be subject to clear conditions to ensure fair competition. For the remaining frequencies, he was inviting private sector companies to provide detailed evidence about technical specification, fully worked out costings and evidence that they possessed the financial backing, management resources and technical competence to run a modern radio-telephone system. He would require evidence of market research to demonstrate that a system using half the available frequencies was viable. Independent consultants would evaluate the rival bids and simultaneously the proposals would be assessed by the Radio Regulatory Department of the Home Office to determine technical suitability to be licensed under the Wireless Telegraphy Acts.

Sources: *Hansard*, Vol 26, No 140, written answers, cols 181-3; Vol 25, No 132, written answers, cols 232-4.

SOCIAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

1981 Census: National and Regional Summary

Among the findings of the 1981 Census of Population are a change in the age structure of the population involving a growth in the proportion of pensioners and a fall in the proportion of young people, a rise in the number of one-person households, an increase in the percentage of households in owner-occupied accommodation, an improvement in the provision of basic household amenities, an increase in the proportion of households having access to a car, and a rise in the proportion of married women going out to work.

These results are contained in a summary produced by the Office of Population Censuses and Surveys,[1] containing final figures of population and housing in Great Britain (England, Wales and Scotland) derived from the 1981 census. Provisional results for population were published in June 1981 (see pp 208-10, 1981).

[1] *OPCS 1981 Census Monitor: Great Britain.* Available from Information Branch, Office of Population Censuses and Surveys, St Catherines House, 10 Kingsway, London WC2B 6JP. 30p. ISBN 0 906197 82 1.

Population

The population present on census night in Great Britain was 54,285,422, an increase of 306,884 (0·6 per cent) compared with the previous census in 1971. There were noticeable regional differences in population change between 1971 and 1981 (see Table 1), ranging from a rise of 12·1 per cent in East Anglia to a fall of 2·8 per cent in the North West. Population density in 1981 averaged 2·38 persons per hectare in Great Britain, the most densely populated area being the North West and the least densely populated being Scotland.

Age Distribution

Table 2 shows the age distribution of the population present in Great Britain on census night. Although the number of people grew by only 0·6 per cent, there were 10 per cent more people of pensionable age (men aged 65 and over, and women of 60 and over) in 1981 than in 1971 and 12 per cent fewer under 16. About 1 in 6 of the population is of pensionable age, nearly one-third of pensioners are aged 75 or over and 24 per cent of households consist solely of pensioners. The proportion of pensioners in the usually resident population was highest in the South West (20·7 per cent) and lowest in the West Midlands (16·1

Table 1

Population Present on Census Night

	Number		Percentage change		Area	Persons per
	1971	1981	1961-71	1971-81	(hectares)	hectare (1981)
England:	46,018,371	46,362,836	5·89	0·75	13,043,871	3·55
North	3,142,323	3,104,353	0·71	−1·21	1,540,083	2·02
Yorkshire and Humberside	4,856,039	4,860,484	3·74	0·09	1,542,038	3·15
East Midlands	3,632,875	3,819,187	9·40	5·13	1,562,976	2·44
East Anglia	1,669,477	1,871,635	13·60	12·11	1,257,332	1·49
South East	16,930,630	16,795,756	5·86	−0·80	2,722,161	6·17
South West	4,080,589	4,348,908	10·61	6·58	2,384,936	1·82
West Midlands	5,109,578	5,148,345	7·40	0·76	1,301,274	3·96
North West	6,596,860	6,414,168	2·61	−2·77	733,071	8·75
Wales	2,731,204	2,791,851	3·30	2·22	2,076,833	1·34
England and Wales	48,749,575	49,154,687	5·74	0·83	15,120,704	3·25
Scotland	5,228,963	5,130,735	0·96	−1·88	7,716,695	0·66
Great Britain	53,978,538	54,285,422	5·25	0·57	22,837,399	2·38

Table 2

Age Distribution in Great Britain 1971 and 1981

Population present on census night; per cent aged	1971	1981
0-4	8·1	6·0
5-15	17·3	16·2
16-24	13·1	14·2
25-34	12·4	14·2
35-44	11·7	12·0
45 and under pensionable age	21·1	19·5
All of pensionable age	16·3	17·9

per cent). Conversely the proportion of those aged under 16 in the usually resident population was highest in the West Midlands (23·4 per cent) and lowest in the South West (21·2 per cent).

Employment

Some 79·9 per cent of men aged 16 to 64 were in employment (full-time or part-time) at some time in the week before census day (compared with 88 per cent in 1971), 10·5 per cent were out of employment and the remaining 9·6 per cent were economically inactive including 5·3 per cent who were full-time students. In the same period 56·2 per cent of women aged 16 to 59 were in employment (varying between 58·4 per cent in the South East and 49·8 per cent in Wales), 4·7 per cent out of employment and 39·1 per cent economically inactive. There was an increase in the proportion of married women aged 16 to 59 who were economically active, from 48·8 per cent in 1971 to 56·9 per cent in 1981.

Dependent Children

Of the 19·5 million private households in Great Britain in April 1981, 2·5 million (12·8 per cent) had a child or children under the age of five, ranging from 13·5 per cent in Scotland to 11·7 per cent in the South West. Nearly 1·4 million households (7 per cent) had three or more dependent children. There were 414,000 households in which one or more children aged under 16 lived with only one adult (a person aged 16 or over) and 6 per cent of children under 16 lived in such households.

Living Alone

Between 1971 and 1981 there was an increase of 989,590 (29·9 per cent) in the number of households with only one person present on census night. Households in which one person usually lived alone totalled 4·2 million, 21·8 per cent of private households. Some 7·9 per cent of the usually resident population of Great Britain lived alone, varying from 8·3 per cent in the South East to 7·2 per cent in the West Midlands.

Household Characteristics

A major feature of housing tenure has been the growth in owner occupation. Between 1971 and 1981 the number of households in owner-occupied accommodation in Great Britain rose by 2·1 million, from 48 per cent of households to 55·7 per cent (see Table 3), while there was a

Table 3

Housing Characteristics: Tenure, Amenities and Availability of Car

Percentage of households

	Owner occupied	Rented from Council or new town	Rented from Private landlord, housing association, with a job or business	Not in self-contained accommodation	With more than one person per room	Lacking or sharing use of a bath	With no car
England:	57·6	28·8	13·6	1·4	3·4	3·1	38·6
North	47·1	40·6	12·4	0·4	3·8	1·9	48·3
Yorkshire and Humberside	56·2	32·3	11·5	0·6	3·4	2·5	45·5
East Midlands	59·6	28·5	11·8	0·5	2·8	2·4	37·2
East Anglia	58·4	26·6	15·0	0·5	2·0	3·1	30·7
South East	57·3	26·4	16·3	2·4	3·6	3·9	35·9
South West	63·2	21·9	15·0	1·6	2·2	3·1	30·9
West Midlands	57·4	32·2	10·4	0·5	4·0	2·4	37·9
North West	59·6	29·5	10·9	0·9	3·7	3·1	44·5
Wales	60·5	29·2	10·3	0·8	2·8	4·4	38·0
England and Wales	57·8	28·8	13·4	1·3	3·4	3·2	38·5
Scotland	34·7	54·6	10·7	0·6	14·1	2·6	48·7
Great Britain	55·7	31·2	13·2	1·3	4·3	3·2	39·5
Great Britain 1971	*48·0*	*30·4*	*21·6*	*na*	*7·2*	*12·2*	*49·0*

na=not available.

substantial fall in the number in the private rented sector. The proportion in owner-occupied accommodation in 1981 ranged from 63·2 per cent in the South West to 34·7 per cent in Scotland.

Only 3·2 per cent of households lacked, or had to share with another household, the use of a fixed bath or shower, compared with 12·2 per cent in 1971. There was also a decline, from 7·2 per cent in 1971 to 4·3 per cent in 1981, in the proportion of households averaging more than one person per room.

The proportion of households with no car available for use by members of the household fell from 49 per cent in 1971 to 39·5 per cent in 1981, when the proportion ranged from 48·7 per cent in Scotland to 30·7 per cent in East Anglia.

The Police and the Community

Guidelines for local consultation arrangements between the community and the police have been issued by the Home Office. This follows the acceptance by the Home Secretary of the recommendation by Lord Scarman in his report on the Brixton disorders (see pp 373-8, 1981) that formal consultation arrangements between the community and the police should be expanded. The development of better understanding and mutual support between the community and the police is seen by the Government as a crucial element in enhancing police effectiveness.

Home Secretary's Statement

In a parliamentary reply on 16 June (*Hansard*, Vol 25, No 133, written answers, cols 281-2) the Home Secretary, Mr William Whitelaw, said that guidance about local consultation arrangements between the community and the police was being issued that day. The guidance was being sent to chief officers of police and police authorities in England and Wales and, in London, to the Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis, to each Metropolitan Police District and to the chief executive of each borough. It covered the purpose and aims of local consultation and the machinery that might be appropriate to support it within the existing statutory framework for policing.

A regular means of local consultation could enable local views to be taken into account by the police and, at the same time, provide opportunities for the community to gain a better understanding of the police, said Mr Whitelaw. He believed that there was a need in all areas for an agreed means of consultation and he hoped that this two-way flow of information would encourage a constructive response by the local community in joint efforts to discourage and prevent crime. The success of the arrangements depended upon the full support and active participation of the community. Those involved would need to understand the purposes of, and the limits to, consultative arrangements. The guidance was also being distributed, with the assistance of the Commission for Racial Equality and the National Council for Voluntary Organisations, to community relations councils and ethnic minority organisations, and to councils for voluntary service; it was also being circulated to chief probation officers, chief education officers and directors of social services.

Mr Whitelaw said that the issue of the guidelines fulfilled the commitment made after the publication of Lord Scarman's report (see pp 31-2); he was still considering the views put to him on the question of statutory consultation procedures. Much good work had already been done in many areas. He was sure that those concerned would seek to build on this in the light of the guidance and develop consultative arrangements best suited to their own areas.

The Guidelines

The guidelines have been drawn up on the basis of discussions held with a number of organisations and are aimed at producing effective consultative arrangements that will lead to a sustained improvement in relations between the community and the police. The resulting exchange of information will enable the police to take local views into account when doing their job and encourage the community to shoulder its share of responsibility for tackling the problems of an area. The kinds of issue that could arise include: practical opportunities for the community to gain better understanding of the police and for police officers to get to know better the local community; joint efforts to prevent and discourage such crimes as vandalism and racial attacks; better community understanding of the limits of what the police can do in response to local problems; and practical advice and assistance to members of the community in their dealings with the police.

The membership of the consultative machinery is expected to be flexible and wide-ranging and local councillors and Members of Parliament should be involved. Such local services as the probation, housing, recreation, education and social services should take part. The pattern of consultation is expected to vary between forces but the guidelines give examples of possible arrangements. Where special arrangements already exist, for example, crime prevention panels, juvenile liaison and ethnic minority committees, it would be appropriate to see how they can be involved in the consultation process.

Consultations in Lambeth

In accepting Lord Scarman's recommendation on the expansion of consultative arrangements between the community and the police the Home Secretary undertook to set up early discussions on arrangements in Lambeth, the London borough in which Brixton is situated. As Police Authority for the Metropolitan area, the Home Secretary called meetings of more than 40 political and community representatives in Lambeth to re-establish the consultative machinery in the borough which, Lord Scarman pointed out, had broken down in 1979. As a result the Community/Police Consultative Group was formed and held its first meeting in March 1982.

Ancient Monuments and Historic Buildings

A new agency is to be set up to take over responsibility for the management of ancient monuments and for giving grants for work on historic buildings in England.

The Government intends to set up an ancient monuments and historic buildings agency in England on the broad lines of proposals in the consultation document *Organisation of Ancient Monuments and Historic Buildings in England* (see p 380, 1981). Announcing in a parliamentary reply (*Hansard*, Vol 25, No 132, written answers, cols 235-6) the publication of a document which sets out in detail the conclusions from the consultation process,[1] the Secretary of State for the Environment, Mr Michael Heseltine, said that he had received more than 300 comments on the proposals that he had put forward to amalgamate the Ancient Monuments Board for England, the Historic Buildings Council for England and the relevant responsibilities of the Department of the Environment. The level of response reflected the high degree of interest in the proposal, and the comments had been extremely helpful in deciding the best way forward, Mr Heseltine said. The Government had concluded that there was a clear balance of advantage in England in proceeding along the broad lines described in the consultation document. A Bill to effect the change would be introduced as soon as legislative time was available, with the aim of establishing the new organisation in October 1983 or April 1984, depending on the time needed for necessary preparations.

The document notes the Government's conviction that 'an agency for ancient monuments and historic buildings will make a major contribution towards improving the high standard of care applied to the nation's heritage. It will provide a central and fully committed voice for conservation. Yet as an accountable public body it will be answerable to a minister and through him to Parliament. In this way the Government will continue, through broad policy and resource controls, to exercise their overall responsibility for the heritage.' A single, powerful body, staffed by people able to make a career in the service of Britain's heritage and operating within an appropriate financial framework, would perform better than the present organisation and would help those dedicated to the preservation and presentation of ancient monuments and historic buildings. There could be greater use of the educational potential of sites, increased revenue through better commercial operation and greater access to voluntary assistance. However, the first priority of the new agency would be preservation; improvements in presentation and the income generated by monuments should 'not be sought at the expense of unworthy exploitation of our heritage'.

Problems had been raised by the question of the royal palaces and parks, which the consultation document had proposed should continue to be the responsibility of the Department of the Environment. Many respondents had argued that a major heritage organisation should not be deprived of outstanding sites such as the Tower of London and Hampton Court Palace, and that the fabric of these historically vital buildings would be best looked after by a body containing the finest architectural, archaeological and craft competence available in the country. Further consideration would be given to this issue. Differing views had also been expressed on the future role of the Royal Commission on Historic Monuments in England, and time was needed for further thought on this.

In separate parliamentary replies (*Hansard*, Vol 25, No 132, written answers, cols 229, 267-8; Vol 26, No 136, written answers, col 18), the Secretaries of State for Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland announced that, following appropriate consultations, they had all concluded that the present arrangements for ancient monuments and historic buildings should continue in the areas for which they are responsible.

[1] *Organisation of Ancient Monuments and Historic Buildings in England: The Way Forward*. HMSO, £3·55. ISBN 0 11 751624 4.

The Arts in Britain

Reviewing the state of the arts in Britain, the Minister for the Arts has referred to such developments as the opening of the Barbican Centre in London and the expansion of several museums and galleries, which will increase public access to the arts. He also discussed public investment in the arts and the role of business sponsorship; measures to preserve Britain's national heritage; the introduction of a Public Lending Right for authors; a new framework for the development of public libraries and the decision to start building a new home for the British Library.

Speaking at a press conference to mark the first National Arts Day[1] on 24 June, the Minister for the Arts, Mr Paul Channon, said that there was no standstill in arts activities. New developments were taking place and there was no reason to believe that they would not continue to do so. In spite of the effects of a harsh economic climate in recent years, these developments had given the British people much to celebrate.

Commenting on the objective of National Arts Day, which was to 'raise the level of participation in and awareness of the arts', Mr Channon said that it was of fundamental importance to those with responsibility for supporting and funding the arts that access to and involvement in arts activities should be as wide as possible. Some new developments both in London and in the regions, he added, would increase such access. A combination of public and private funding had made possible the opening of the Boilerhouse

[1] National Arts Day, organised by independent trustees, is a new national festival designed to focus attention on Britain's artistic achievements.

Exhibition[1] at the Victoria and Albert Museum, the go-ahead for extensions to the Tate and National Galleries, and the opening of a new gallery at the Crafts Council. The decision to make the Science and Victoria and Albert Museums independent of Government, and to create new boards of trustees to guide them, had opened up new prospects for those two great museums. The Barbican Centre was now open and attracting very large audiences to its theatre and concert hall (see p 93), and the new extension to the Royal Opera House would be opened by the Prince of Wales on 19 July. Outside London, the Museum of Photography in Bradford and the proposed northern base for the Tate Gallery in Liverpool (see p 244, 1981), were exciting developments for the future. With the support of the Arts Council, regional theatre had undergone a transformation and standards of opera, music and dance outside London had never been higher.

Public investment in the arts had been considerable in recent years. Inevitably there were problems, but Mr Channon believed that the arts had had a reasonable share of necessarily limited resources, and the arts budget had continued to grow. Business sponsorship of the arts had increased markedly during the last three years and business was now playing an important part in enabling new developments to take place. Sponsorship was running at about £7 million a year, which demonstrated the commitment of business to the arts and their belief in its value to business. He hoped it would continue to grow, to complement public support, not as a substitute for it.

Mr Channon said that the Government was doing all it could to ensure that the development of the arts could continue. Equally important was the Government's commitment to preserving the best of the national heritage, which was one of Britain's most precious resources. At a time when finances were limited it was more important than ever that particular attention should be paid to ensuring that all that was best from the past could be preserved. This meant not simply works of art, but the nation's historic homes and buildings and even the land itself.

The passage of the National Heritage Act in 1980 and the setting up of the National Heritage Memorial Fund had been one of the most significant achievements of the new decade (see p 95, 1980). The Fund had already proved an invaluable safety net in the protection of Britain's past and in doing so had opened many eyes to the enormous range encompassed by its heritage. The Government's philosophy was that wherever possible private owners should be encouraged to keep works of art of heritage quality, provided that they agreed to care for them and make them available for the public to see.

Turning to other developments which would provide significant benefits for the future, Mr Channon said that the Government had now succeeded in introducing a Public Lending Right scheme to help authors (see p 439, 1978). It enabled authors to benefit financially for the first time when their books were borrowed from public libraries. The Public Lending Right Act 1978, and the resulting scheme, had been passed with all-party support, a Registrar had been appointed and the Office for Public Lending Right set up in Stockton-on-Tees. Authors could register their books from 1 September, and after statistics had been collected the first payments would be made in the next financial year.

Working together with the Library and Information Services Council, the Office of Arts and Libraries was creating a new framework for the development of public libraries. The recognition of the vital role for information services within the library system was also an important sign for the future.

Most important for the future, however, was the announcement last year that a start would be made on a new building for the British Library. The project was now under way and Mr Channon was convinced that in future years this would be considered one of the Government's greatest achievements.

[1]A permanent exhibition of industrial design.

Shorter Note

SPORTS SPONSORSHIP BY THE TOBACCO INDUSTRY

The Government has reached a new voluntary agreement with the tobacco industry on the industry's continuing sponsorship of sport. This replaces a previous agreement which came into operation in December 1977. The new agreement will run until at least 31 December 1985 and the amount of money spent by the industry on sponsorship will be maintained at its 1976 level, adjusted for inflation (this figure is not published). Government health warnings will appear on press and poster advertising for, and on agreed static promotional signs at, sponsored sporting activities.

The Minister for Sport will be informed by the companies of their sponsorship plans, and any changes in those plans, and the companies will consult him on any proposal to sponsor a sport not previously sponsored by the industry. Activities in which the majority of the participants are under 18 years of age will not be sponsored. As well as sponsoring televised and other major events the companies will continue to sponsor non-televised, minor and amateur activities. The companies will use their best endeavours to keep expenditure on media advertising and promotional activities within a reasonable proportion of total sports sponsorship expenditure.

A separate agreement on the general advertising and promotion of cigarettes and tobacco is still under discussion. The agreement will cover expenditure on posters, health warnings, and the tar yield of cigarettes and will replace a previous agreement, concluded in November 1980, which will expire on 31 July this year (see pp 373-4, 1980). As a result of the discussions the industry has already promised to spend £3 million a year on independent research into health education.

DOCUMENTATION

Government and Administration

Civil Service Commission: Annual Report 1981. Reports a fall in the number of vacancies in the Civil Service in 1981, due partly to the continuing reduction in the size of the Civil Service and partly to the fact that fewer people left for other employment. At the same time applications for the main competitions increased. As a result most non-specialist vacancies were filled. Difficulty was experienced in 1981 in recruiting specialists in several areas of high technology where national demand was great.

The report points out that from January 1983 the Commission will withdraw entirely from handling recruitment to the more junior grades, thus enabling it to reduce its staff and concentrate on the more senior grades where centralised recruitment remains desirable.

Available free from the Civil Service Commission, Alencon Link, Basingstoke, Hants RG21 1JB. ISBN 0 903741 65 2.

External Affairs and Defence

Statement on the Defence Estimates 1982 (see p 223).

Volume I. Cmnd 8529-I. HMSO, £4. ISBN 0 10 185290 8.

Volume II. Cmnd 8529-II. HMSO, £4·50. ISBN 0 10 185291 6.

Economic and Scientific Affairs

Budgetary Reform. Sixth Report from the House of Commons Treasury and Civil Service Committee. Together with the Proceedings of the Committee, the Minutes of Evidence and Appendices. HMSO, £10·90. ISBN 0 10 213782 X.

The Bank of England. COI, No 146/82. (French and Spanish editions in preparation.)

Youth Task Group Report. Available free from the Manpower Services Commission, Selkirk House, 166 High Holborn, London WC1V 6PF.

National Enterprise Board. Annual Report and Accounts 1981. British Technology Group (see p 252). Obtainable from the BTG Information Department at 12-18 Grosvenor Gardens, London SW1W 0DW until 31 October 1982; thereafter at 101 Newington Causeway, London SE1 6BU. £2·75.

Insolvency Law and Practice. Report of the Review Committee (Chairman Sir Kenneth Cork). The final report of the Committee (which was set up in 1977) concludes that extensive changes are required to the law on insolvency, bankruptcy, liquidation and receiverships. It suggests simplified procedures, a distinction between the treatment of dishonest insolvents and those who are merely incompetent, and a new concept of 'wrongful trading' to make irresponsible directors personally liable for their companies' debts. Other proposals include a larger share of any assets for unsecured creditors and a means of keeping insolvent businesses going to preserve employees' jobs. Altogether there are more than 100 linked recommendations. Cmnd 8558. HMSO, £13·35. ISBN 0 10 185580 X.

Agriculture in Scotland. Report for 1981. Cmnd 8545. HMSO, £5·10. ISBN 0 10 185450 1.

Water Supply in Britain. COI, No 135/82. (Spanish edition in preparation.)

Fixed Channel Link Report of UK/French Study Group (see p 252). Cmnd 8561. Department of Transport. HMSO, £6·40. ISBN 0 10 185610 5.

National Bus Company. Annual Report 1981. Available from the NBC, 25 New Street Square, London EC4A 3AP. £2.

Rural Road Passenger Transport and Ferries. Second Report from the House of Commons Committee on Scottish Affairs, Session 1981-82.

Volume 1. Report, Proceedings of the Committee and Index. HMSO, £4·35. ISBN 0 10 217882 8.

Volume 2. Minutes of Evidence and Appendices. HMSO, £10·90. ISBN 0 10 008342 0.

British Waterways Board. Annual Report and Accounts for 1981. BWB. Available from HMSO, £3·50. ISBN 0 903218 26 7.

First Report of the House of Lords Select Committee on Science and Technology, Session 1981-82.

Volume I. Report. HMSO, £3·95. ISBN 0 10 440182 6.

Volume II. Evidence. HMSO, £9·70. ISBN 0 10 440282 2.

Science and Government. Government Observations on the First Report of the House of Lords Select Committee on Science and Technology, Session 1981-82. Proposals to be implemented include broader terms of reference for the Advisory Council for Applied Research and Development (ACARD); closer links between ACARD and the Advisory Board for the Research Councils; the introduction of periodic reports on science and technology; the establishment of a committee of departmental chief scientists; improved links between those responsible for civil and for defence research; and the introduction of a system of annual reviews of research, intended to make Britain's research effort more effective. Cmnd 8591. HMSO, £1·65. ISBN 0 10 185910 4.

Report of a Joint Working Party on the Support of University Scientific Research. Advisory Board for the Research Councils and University Grants Committee. The report says that while the present dual support system for financing university research is sound in principle and should be retained, certain adjustments are necessary in the light of reductions in public spending. Among other conclusions, the report recommends that universities should channel proportionately more of their funds into research; that research funds should be concentrated more into selected areas; and that new sources of funding should be sought and links between universities and industry increased. Cmnd 8567. HMSO, £4·35. ISBN 0 10 185670 9.

Social and Cultural Affairs

OPCS 1981 Census Monitor: Great Britain (see p 254). Available from Information Branch, Office of Population Censuses and Surveys, St Catherines House, 10 Kingsway, London WC2B 6JP. 30p. ISBN 0 906197 82 1.

Police Complaints Procedures. Fourth Report from the Home Affairs Committee, Session 1981-82.

Volume I. Report with Minutes of Proceedings. The Committee's terms of reference were to examine ways of improving the machinery for investigating complaints against the police. HMSO, £3·95. ISBN 0 10 008082 0.

Volume II. Evidence and Appendices. HMSO, £12·40. ISBN 0 10 008092 8.

© *Crown copyright 1982*

Printed in England by Brown Knight & Truscott Ltd and Published by
HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE
£1.35 net

Annual subscription including indices and postage £20.42

Dd 8298582 K8 JULY/1982
ISBN 0 11 726753 8 Vol. 12 No. 7
ISSN 0039—6214

Report of the Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis for the year 1981. Cmnd 8569. HMSO, £7·35. ISBN 0 10 185690 3.

On the State of the Public Health for the Year 1980. A report by the Chief Medical Officer on the state of public health and the functioning of the National Health Service. HMSO, £6·75. ISBN 0 11 320776 X.

Department of Education and Science. Annual Report 1981. HMSO, £5·35. ISBN 0 11 270529 4.

Technology in Schools. A study by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of technology courses in 90 schools in England and Wales. Gives information on the structure, content and organisation of courses and on other ways in which schools attempt to introduce technology into the curriculum. HMSO, £2·25. ISBN 0 11 270555 3.

Mathematics in the Sixth Form. A report by Her Majesty's Inspectors discussing the role of mathematics in the sixth form, methods of teaching and learning, and the way these might respond to changing circumstances. Based on a survey of 89 schools and sixth form colleges during 1978–80. HMSO, £3·50. ISBN 0 11 270531 6.

Equal Opportunities Commission, Annual Report 1981. Records cases of discrimination against women in such fields as employment and education and recommends the strengthening of the Equal Pay and Sex Discrimination Acts in order to improve women's relative earnings. HMSO, £3. ISBN 0 905829 54 9.

Commission for Racial Equality. Annual Report 1981. Although 1981 was in some respects the most difficult in the five years of the Commission's existence, there were again many positive developments, says the report. Priority in funding local projects was given to youth training and counselling, employment projects, advice centres and community projects, educational provision, ethnic minority arts and services for elderly members of the ethnic minorities. Of 846 complaints received of alleged discrimination, 63 per cent concerned discrimination in employment. HMSO, £4·85. ISBN 0 10 243782 3.

Organisation of Ancient Monuments and Historic Buildings in England: The Way Forward (see p 257). HMSO, £3·55. ISBN 0 11 751624 4.

Countryside Commission for Scotland: Fourteenth Report, January-December 1981. HMSO, £2·25. ISBN 0 902226 62 2.